MARCH 1958

VICTORIAN STUDIES

a quarterly journal
of the
Humanities, Arts, and Sciences

VOL 1 / NO 3

published at Indiana University

VICTORIAN STUDIES IS PUBLISHED QUARTERLY AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY, BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA, IN SEPTEMBER, DECEMBER, MARCH, AND JUNE. PRICE FIVE DOLLARS OR THIRTY-FIVE SHILLINGS PER YEAR. ALL FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS ARE POST FREE. ANY CHANGE OF ADDRESS SHOULD BE REPORTED PROMPTLY TO AVOID DELAY OR LOSS IN THE MAILS. SECOND-CLASS MAIL PRIVILEGES HAVE BEEN AUTHORIZED AT BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA, U. S. A.

VOL 1. NO 3 / MARCH 1958

VICTORIAN STUDIES

215 *George Haines, IV* : GERMAN INFLUENCE UPON SCIENTIFIC INSTRUCTION IN ENGLAND, 1867-1887

245 *Anthony Quinton* : THE NEGLECT OF VICTORIAN PHILOSOPHY

255 *C. E. Tanzy* : BROWNING, EMERSON, AND BISHOP BLOUGRAM

267 *G. F. A. Best* : THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY 19TH-CENTURY GROUP

268 *Maurice B. Reckitt* : WHEN DID "VICTORIANISM" END?

271 *Brison D. Gooch* : THE CRIMEAN WAR IN DOCUMENTS AND SECONDARY WORKS SINCE 1940

281 : BOOK REVIEWS

303 : ADVERTISEMENTS

307 : COMMENTS AND QUERIES

308 : CONTRIBUTORS

editors Philip Appleman William A. Madden Michael Wolff

book review editor Donald J. Gray

advisory board Richard D. Altick Noel Annan William O. Aydelotte Isaiah Berlin T. S. R. Boase Asa Briggs Crane Brinton Jerome H. Buckley John W. Dodds Leon Edel Frederic E. Faverty Gordon S. Haight Henry-Russell Hitchcock T. W. Hutchison Howard Mumford Jones G. Kitson Clark Harry Levin Francis E. Mineka Henri Peyre Anthony Quinton Gordon N. Ray Donald Smalley Geoffrey Tillotson Kathleen Tillotson Jacob Viner Conway Zirkle

editorial consultant William Riley Parker

design consultant William Friedman

VICTORIAN STUDIES

George Haines, IV

GERMAN INFLUENCE UPON SCIENTIFIC INSTRUCTION IN ENGLAND, 1867-1887

IN HIS STUDY of the Anglo-German trade rivalry, Ross J. Hoffman wrote, "Strong competition was being felt [in England] in comparatively few areas and no serious opinion before 1880 envisaged Great Britain being driven from the markets of the world. Rather the tendency was to scout fears and minimize alarm for the future."[1] True as this is for the businessmen, politicians, and journalists, the statement ignores an important segment of English opinion. That German competition in trade would sooner or later become a threat to England's industrial supremacy had been long foreseen by British scientists and scholars who had either been trained in German laboratories and seminars, come under the influence of Prince Albert, or discovered for themselves Germany's remarkable educational development.[2] It was these scientists and scholars, aided by a few industrialists, who began in 1867 to awaken and stimulate British fear of the German trade rivalry. They raised the alarm in order to persuade their fellow-countrymen of the necessity of supporting education generally and instruction in the sciences particularly. They knew that England had fallen behind in both. To these men, and through them to the German influence, must be largely attributed the educational awakening England experienced in the two decades between the passage of the Second Reform Bill and the Jubilee year.

Three phases of activity on behalf of scientific instruction can be distinguished in these two decades: a reform of the old and the found-

1 Ross J. Hoffman, *Great Britain and the German Trade Rivalry* (Philadelphia, 1933), p. 20.

2 See George Haines, IV, *German Influence Upon English Education and Science, 1800-1866* (New London, Conn., 1957).

ing of new institutions of learning at the college level, the introduction of laboratory instruction in the sciences, and the extension of technical education. Of these the second was of greatest importance since without it the others would have been next to worthless, and this was the one most directly influenced by the German example. But they were interrelated and the German influence was an active stimulus in all.

I

Until the Austro-Prussian War, little attention was paid to the Germanies by Englishmen generally. But immediately thereafter the International Exhibition in Paris led them to an uneasy recognition of Germany's prowess in industry as well as in war. Among those exercised by the superiority of both the German and French to the English exhibits was Lyon Playfair. Trained in Liebig's laboratory at Giessen and closely associated for some years with the Prince Consort, he had been expecting the advance of German industry.[3] In the course of a discussion with the English jurors at the Exhibition, he was persuaded to address a letter on the subject to the Taunton School Inquiry Commission. It was accompanied by a letter from Lord Granville in which he associated the "lessons which the late war in Germany and the present Exhibition in Paris afforded us."[4] The Commission circularized Playfair's letter among the English jurors for comment. Of the sixteen men to whom the letter went, fourteen agreed, with minor reservations, that the neglect of education in science and technology ("science and industrial arts") by England was "permitting other nations to advance in industry at a much greater rate than our own country," and supported Playfair's suggestion for a government commission to make an official inquiry on the subject.[5]

Two industrialists, Anthony John Mundella and Bernhard Samuelson, appeared as allies for the scientists. Mundella was partner in a large hosiery concern of Nottingham. Visiting Chemnitz in Saxony,

[3] Wemyss Reid, *Memoirs and Correspondence of Lyon Playfair* (London, 1899), passim. See also Playfair's *Industrial Instruction on the Continent* (London, 1853) and *The Study of Abstract Science Essential to the Progress of Industry* (London, 1855).

[4] Both letters are in the Fifth Report of the Commissioners for the Exhibition of 1851, Appendix O, *Parliamentary Papers*, 1867 [3933] XXIII, 117-119.

[5] Loc. cit., 121-143. Two jurors either made no reply or their replies were not recorded. Cf. W. T. Jeans, *The Creators of the Age of Steel* (New York, 1884), pp. 256-260, who associates with this movement the founding of the Whitworth scholarships.

where his firm had a branch, "what he saw there led him to study closely the educational system of Saxony, Prussia, and other states."[6] Mundella was one of those to whom Playfair's letter was sent by the Taunton Commission. In reply he wrote, "The contrast betwixt the workpeople of England and Saxony, engaged in the same industry, is humiliating" (*Parliamentary Papers*, 1867 [3933] XXIII, 142). Elected to Parliament, he became a devoted worker for public education. Samuelson, German-born but taken to England as a child, was an iron manufacturer with considerable experience of Continental business. Alarmed by the advances made in Germany, in 1867 he undertook a private investigation of technical instruction in Belgium, France, Switzerland, and Germany ("Samuelson, Bernhard," *DNB*).

On a motion by Samuelson, a Select Committee was appointed by the Commons in 1868 to investigate technical education abroad.[7] Its report included Samuelson's account of his own survey, in which he wrote almost lyrically of the German technical higher schools; a long study by Professor Leone Levi of King's College, London, in which a great expansion of scientific and technical training facilities was recommended; and reports from Britain's official representatives abroad, who were circularized for the committee by Lord Stanley of the Foreign Office.[8] This represented the first serious effort made by Parliament to study the comparative position of English technical education and led to public discussions in the principal cities of Britain.[9]

Other testimony supported this report. In 1868 Matthew Arnold's study of the Continental schools and universities was published with its sharp warning of German industrial and commercial success in the new era, the characteristics of which he clearly foresaw.[10] J. Scott Russell, naval architect and "disciple of the Prince Consort," published in 1869

6 "Mundella, Anthony," *DNB*. See also W. H. G. Armytage, *A. J. Mundella, 1825-1897 (London, 1951)*.

7 Hansard, *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd Series, CXCI (1867), 160.

8 *Parliamentary Papers*, 1867-68, LIV includes (137) Report of a Committee appointed by the Council of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, urging more scientific and technical instruction; (168) Answers from Chambers of Commerce to Queries of the Vice-President of the Council as to Technical Education; (13) Letter from B. Samuelson; (33) Report on Technical, Industrial, and Professional Instruction in Italy and other countries by Professor Leone Levi; [4085] Circular of Lord Stanley to her Majesty's Representatives Abroad, together with their replies. Armytage, pp. 51-52, has little on the Committee's origin, but is interesting on Mundella.

9 According to Playfair (Hansard, 3rd Series, CXCVIII, 1869, 204), "The nation was much moved by this report, and public national conferences were held in London, Edinburgh, and in the leading provincial towns, to consider a question so grave to our interest as an industrial country. At all of them resolutions were passed calling upon the Government to promote education in science throughout the country, and to give inducements for the foundation of special technical institutions in the chief centres of industry." See also a review of the Committee's Report, *Edinburgh Review*, CXXVII (1868), 433-468.

10 Matthew Arnold, *Schools and Universities on the Continent* (London, 1868), esp. pp. 278-281.

a book on technical education and England's danger from the better-trained Continentals.[11]

On 17 February 1870 W. E. Forster of Gladstone's cabinet introduced his Elementary Education Bill. After referring to the examples of the United States and Germany, and to the work of the member for Birmingham (Mr. Dixon) and the member for Sheffield (Mr. Mundella) in stimulating educational zeal, he urged: "We must not delay. Upon the speedy provision of elementary education depends our industrial prosperity. It is of no use trying to give technical teaching to our artizans without elementary education; uneducated labourers – and many of our labourers are utterly uneducated – are, for the most part unskilled labourers, and if we leave our work-folk any longer unskilled . . . they will become over-matched in the competition of the world" (Hansard, 3rd Series, CXIX [1870], 466). Already, it is clear, one of the forces to which Forster felt he could appeal directly was the fear of German competition associated with technical education.

In the debate, Dixon argued for the program of the Birmingham Education League: compulsory, free education and a department of education headed by a minister. To Lord Robert Montagu, who insisted that education was already amply provided for, Mundella replied: "He should like to ask hon. Members what they meant when they talked about education. In Germany the term signified that the child had been at school from six to fourteen years of age; but some persons in this country seemed to imagine that it was sufficient for the child's name to have once appeared on the school books for its education to be completed" (Hansard, loc. cit., 477).

To trace the progress of the bill further would be irrelevant to our purpose. What is important here is that the German model and the rising fear of German competition aided the supporters of the movement for primary education and encouraged state intervention in order to lay the basis for technical and scientific instruction.

Meanwhile, in 1869 Norman Lockyer had founded the general scientific journal *Nature* and entered upon his long campaign to promote scientific research and education.[12] *Nature*'s importance was that it provided a medium through which opinion among British scientists could be formulated and communicated. For though journals publishing scientific papers existed, they did little to create a sense of profes-

11 *Systematic Technical Education . . .* (London, 1869). Phrase quoted from *DNB*.

12 T. Mary Lockyer and Winifred L. Lockyer with assistance of Prof. H. Dingle and Others, *Life and Work of Sir Norman Lockyer* (London, 1928), Ch. VI. Lockyer had a secondary school education and a year in Switzerland and France, but little or no training in the sciences.

sional fellowship and responsibility such as a weekly could promote.

To do this had been since its founding an aim of the British Association for the Advancement of Science,[13] but in nineteenth-century England professionalism was suspect. An important article of the laissez-faire creed held that professionalism was monopolistic and encouraged "exclusiveness, selfishness and sloth."[14] The guilds had long since dwindled into social relics, and study associations were extremely heterogeneous in membership, often including as many non-scientific as scientific men.[15] England remained the country of the amateur and specialism was still regarded as not quite gentlemanly.

From the first issue, *Nature* reflected the admiration of informed British scientists for Germany's educational system from the lowest grades through the universities, for her scientific laboratories, and for her scientific achievements. Contrasts drawn between German scientific institutions and achievements and the British consistently pointed to the superiority of the former. The need for reform and diffusion of education in England became one of its major concerns.

Interest in the subject having been awakened, in May, 1870, a Royal Commission on Scientific Instruction and the Advancement of Science was appointed. It was known as the Devonshire Commission, for William Cavendish, Sixth Duke of Devonshire, who served as chairman; Norman Lockyer was appointed its secretary, and through the pages of *Nature*, he kept its work before the scientific public. The other members were Lord Lansdowne, John Lubbock, James Kay-Shuttleworth, Bernhard Samuelson, William Sharpey, T. H. Huxley, George Gabriel Stokes, William Allen Miller and, upon his death, Henry J. S. Smith.[16] For five years this Commission sat, taking evidence from all sorts of industrial, educational, and scientific authorities. Its eight[17] re-

13 O. J. Howarth, *The British Association for the Advancement of Science, 1831-1931* (London, 1931), Ch. I.

14 See A. M. Carr-Saunders and P. A. Wilson, *The Professions* (Oxford, 1933), p. 300.

15 The British Association was in this respect a notable exception, as was also the Royal Society by this date, though the latter had still many non-scientific members. See Sir Henry Lyons, *The Royal Society, 1660-1940* (Cambridge, 1944), Appendix II, p. 342 for the number of Fellows who were and were not scientists at various dates.

16 The Duke of Devonshire was Chancellor of Cambridge University and one time President of Owens College, Manchester. John Lubbock was a banker and entomologist. Kay-Shuttleworth had long been the executive officer for the Privy Council's Committee on Education, administering the Parliamentary grants to education. More will be said of Sharpey and Huxley presently. Stokes and Smith were professors of mathematics at Cambridge and Oxford, respectively. Miller was professor of chemistry at King's College, London, and a former student of Liebig.

17 The reports used here appeared as follows. *Parliamentary Papers:* First Report (reprint of 1871 [C. 318] XXIV) and Second Report, 1872 [C. 536] XXV; Third Report, 1873 [C. 868] XXVIII; Fourth Report, 1874 [C. 884] XXII; Fifth Report, 1874 [C. 1087] XXII; Sixth Report, 1875 [C. 1279] XXVIII; Seventh Report, 1875 [C. 1297] XXVIII; Eighth Report, 1875 [C. 1298] XXVIII. References will be made hereafter to the number of the report only.

ports furnished voluminous evidence of the extraordinary variety, and with that variety the extraordinary inadequacy, of scientific instruction available in the United Kingdom. The incompleteness, due to the lack of any systematic program of instruction in the two oldest universities; the wealth and power of the colleges at Oxford and Cambridge and the poverty and impotence of the university professors and officers; the financial stringency of the London colleges, University and King's, and of Owens College, Manchester; the elementary level of scientific instruction available even in the more advanced schools; and the difficulty the best-trained men had in finding time and facilities for research were spread on the record for all to see.

That the Commissioners feared that the scientific advances on the Continent would soon affect Britain's industrial leadership is evident from the direction taken by their questions to the industrialists and engineers (First Report, pp. 101, 109). The leadership in science and technology of Germany and, after her, France was repeatedly pointed out by the scientists appearing before them. Many of the most eminent scientists in the kingdom were questioned and with the single exception of George Biddell Airy, the aging Astronomer Royal, who found all existing arrangements satisfactory, supported greatly increased government aid to science and scientific instruction (see esp. the Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Reports).

But the Commission's recommendations went much further. "These considerations . . . have impressed upon us," the Commissioners wrote, "the conviction that the Creation of a Special Ministry dealing with Science and with Education is a Necessity of the Public Service" (Eighth Report, p. 45). The minister should be assisted by a board. As Lockyer reported in *Nature*, a division of opinion existed among the scientists concerning the organization of this board. "Two modes may be suggested in which such a board might be organised. First, the Government might formally recognise the President and Council of the Royal Society as its official adviser, imposing the whole responsibility on that body, and leaving it to them to seek advice when necessary. . . . The second method would be to create an entirely new board, somewhat after the model of the old Board of Longitude, but with improvements" (*Nature*, XII [1875], 430). It was the latter that "the balance of argument and authority" was thought to favor by the Commissioners and which they recommended (Eighth Report, pp. 47-48; *Nature*, XII, 470).

To the scientists, at least, what had often been said and yet only partially understood in its full potentiality, that science was power, was

becoming only too evident. In an editorial in 1870, entitled "Scientific Administration," Lockyer declared that the Prussians "are emphatically a scientific people," and credited their new military triumphs "to that preponderating characteristic." The word science implies, he wrote, "simply the employment of means adequate to the attainment of a desired end. Whether that end be the constitution of a government, the organisation of an army or navy, the spread of learning, or the repression of crime." He continued by insisting that: "The same method is necessary to raise, organise, and equip a battalion, as to perform a chemical experiment. It is this great truth that the Germans, above all other nations, if not alone among nations, have thoroughly realised and applied." This was conspicuously lacking among the English. "As a nation we have never realised the necessity for system and completeness in utilising our material resources."[18]

About this description of the cultural characteristics of the two peoples there is today nothing new; we have long been accustomed to regarding the Germans as systematic, methodical, thorough, and the English as a people who "muddle through." But in 1870 this was startling in its reversal of the general opinion,[19] yet it was also almost undeniable, at least as concerned the Germans, in the face of the sudden revelation of their armed might. No longer could the Germans be dismissed as a nation content with metaphysics, music, beer, and the petty politics of provincial courts. Almost overnight Germany had risen to the position of a first rank power, deceptively liberal in government, a leader in scholarship and science, and a challenger in her industrial potential. It was their recognition of the extraordinary increase in power won by the Germans through organization and systematic study that led Lyon Playfair, T. H. Huxley, Matthew Arnold, J. Norman Lockyer, Henry Enfield Roscoe, E. Ray Lankester and, in addition to the industrialists Mundella and Samuelson, Philip Magnus to seek to arouse the English from their long lethargy regarding education, especially in regard to the sciences and technologies, and to stress the German example. A beginning was made between 1867 and 1871. The report of the Select Committee, the debates on the Education Bill, and the reports of the Devonshire Commission undoubtedly led many Englishmen to look to German com-

18 *Nature*, II (1870), 449. For a still more explicit statement, see *Nature*, XXX (1884), 1-3. I have attributed unsigned lead articles in *Nature* to Lockyer.

19 General opinion was probably reflected by the reporter of the Schiller Anniversary Festival held in the Crystal Palace in 1859. "Germany was everywhere, — in the countenances, the talk, the behaviour of the audience, — in the *insignia* of the gentlemen in office, — can we add, without ill nature, in the impractical bustle and gentle confusion which marked the whole transaction." See *Athenaeum*, July-December, 1859, p. 639.

petition as an explanation, however partial, for the depression of 1874-79, when fear of German commercial rivalry first appeared in business and journalistic circles only to be brushed aside when recovery from the depression appeared imminent in the latter year (Hoffman, pp. 14 ff.).

II

Attacks upon Oxford and Cambridge in the 1870's were frequent and harsh and, from the viewpoint of the scientists, warranted by their failure to keep abreast intellectually with the German universities. And they were still the principal institutions of higher learning in England. The degree-granting University of London served as an examining body for numerous small collegiate institutions. Of these, only University College and King's College, London, and Owens College, Manchester, were of any considerable importance. But the ferment produced by the fear of German competition and the work of the scientific commissions in exposing the weakness of Oxford and Cambridge combined with an increased interest in education, resulting from the extension of the suffrage, to lead to the founding of many new colleges which were eventually to achieve university status – the now familiar "Redbrick" or civic universities.

Until 1867, and in many ways for years thereafter, provisions for instruction in the sciences were in both the ancient universities paltry when compared with those in most German universities. Particularly obnoxious in the eyes of the reformers was the control of great wealth by the colleges and the poverty of the universities. Funds in excess probably of £100,000 went yearly in the form of fellowships to young men who succeeded in passing with distinction such examinations as their college tutors set them. These fellowships were tenable for life, whether the holders engaged in work at the universities or preferred to regard the money as a simple annuity, continued celibacy being the principal requirement. Meanwhile the university authorities lacked money to supply either laboratories or lecturers in the sciences.[20] The professorships were also held for life, more than one appointment might be held by one

[20] Speaking of Oxford, Lord Salisbury said, "It seems that if all these 'idle Fellowships' were to be done away with and no one were to hold a Fellowship without doing educational work, we should save . . . a sum of £50,000 to £60,000 or £80,000. That, under an improved system, could be applied to University purposes" (Hansard, 3rd Series, CCXXVII, 1876, 797-798). See the account in A. I. Tillyard, *A History of University Reform* (Cambridge, 1913), especially p. 214.

man, and he did not necessarily reside at the university or teach.[21] Such a situation invited attack, but our interest in the attacks is limited to two things: first, as indicating the influence of the German example upon the reform of the two universities and, second, as they may have influenced the founding of the new colleges.

Although it seems the fashion to say that the two ancient universities were "reformed from within" during this period, the statement is at best partial and misleading. Though it is true that many of the professors and tutors of both universities were active in behalf of some change, it is doubtful that they would have had much success had their efforts not been assisted by outsiders and especially by the Devonshire Commission and the Commissions for the Universities of the late 1870's.[22] This is particularly true of Oxford. Insofar, however, as reform came from within, those most active in the cause of reform were frequently men who admired, or had studied in, the German universities. Opponents of reform continually taunted the reformers with wishing to make the universities into Prussianized institutions.[23]

An example of the efforts of the reformers was a meeting held in London on Saturday, 16 November 1872, "by members of the Universities and others interested in the promotion of mature study and scientific research in England."[24] Presiding was Mark Pattison, Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford, a staunch reformer, strongly influenced by the German system.[25] In addition to George Rolleston and Benjamin Brodie, also of Oxford, and the historian J. R. Seeley of Cambridge, among those participating were T. H. Huxley and W. T. Thiselton-Dyer of the School of Mines, and W. K. Clifford, W. B. Carpenter, and John Burdon-Sanderson of University College, London. Criticism centered on the system of fellowships, the desirability of a graded teaching body composed

21 For example, see the evidence given by E. B. Pusey, 22 July 1867, regarding the London residence of the professor of civil law and the Lee's Reader for chemistry in the Special Report of the Select Committee on the Oxford and Cambridge Universities Education Bill, *Parliamentary Papers*, 1867 (497) XIII, 192, 199. For a later instance, see Thomas Martin, *The Royal Institution* (London, n. d.), p. 38.

22 As careful a statement as any is that of D. M. Winstanley, *Later Victorian Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1947), p. 331: "it does seem safe to say that a majority of the resident members were willing to go along with the Council along the road of reform . . ." Even this can hardly be said of Oxford. B. C. Brodie in his testimony before the Devonshire Commission, First Report, 235-236, was strongly of the opinion that without legislation no comprehensive scheme of reform especially with respect to the award of fellowships, could be carried. See also Archbishop Tait's comments, cited by Tillyard, p. 216.

23 Tillyard, pp. 85, 217, *et passim*. This was perhaps inevitable because the reformers so continually referred to the German universities.

24 *The Times* (London), 20 November 1872, p. 4. Winstanley, p. 267, omits the words "and others" thus allowing the unwary reader to conclude that this was also a reform effort "from within." This passage in Winstanley is cited expressly for that purpose by W.H.G. Armytage, *Civic Universities* (London, 1955), p. 233.

25 See Mark Pattison, *Memoirs* (London, 1885), *passim*. Tillyard, pp. 162 ff. *Nature*, XIV (1876), p. 552.

of scholars with a specialist's knowledge of their subject, and the need of facilities for research, especially in the sciences.[26]

Shortly thereafter, Brodie contributed to *Nature* an article, "Scientific Research and University Endowments," which probably reflected his remarks at the November meeting (*Nature*, VII [1872], 97-98). After condemning the sinecure fellowships, he found that science was handicapped in England "by the utter apathy in regard to the advancement of knowledge which has so long prevailed at the English Universities, which, without any doubt, is the main cause of our disasters." The English situation was in sorry contrast to Germany where "the universities are the very centers of intellectual progress." Throughout these decades such attacks appeared in *Nature* time and again.

The characteristic theme during the depression of the mid-seventies was sounded by Thomas Andrews in his presidential address before the British Association for the Advancement of Science, meeting in Glasgow in 1876. "It may perhaps appear to many," he said, "a paradoxical assertion to maintain that the industries of the country should look to the calm and serene regions of Oxford and Cambridge for help in the troublous times of which we have now a sharp and severe note of warning. But I have not spoken on light grounds. . . . If Great Britain is to retain the commanding position she has so long occupied in skilled manufacture the easy ways . . . which have sufficed for the past will not be found to suffice for the future. The highest training which can be brought to bear on practical science will be imperatively required; and it will be a fatal policy if that training is to be sought for in foreign lands because it cannot be obtained at home." And after citing at length the example of the University of Berlin and German education generally, he concluded: "The outlay which is incurred by any country for the promotion of science and of high instruction will yield a certain return; and Germany has not had long to wait for the ingathering of the fruits of her far-sighted policy" (*Nature*, XIV [1876], 97-98).

The most devastating attack came, however, from E. Ray Lankester, a Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford, and professor of zoology at University College, London. Published in full in the *British Medical Journal* (5 October 1878), his address was summarized in *Nature* (XIV [1878], 610-614). After deploring the status of medical study in Britain,

[26] Brodie had studied with Liebig at Giessen and greatly admired the German universities. See his testimony in *Parliamentary Papers*, 1867 (C. 497) XIII, 1-3. In 1867 in "Liberal Education in Universities," Seeley contrasted the encouragement of research and scholarship in the German universities with the failure in this respect of Oxford and Cambridge. See his *Roman Imperium and Other Essays* (Boston, 1871), pp. 198-202, 215, and 228-229. On Burdon-Sanderson, see below.

Lankester described in detail the situation at the small University of Heidelberg, which was supported by the Grand Duchy of Baden. Referring then briefly to the other German universities, he noted that Berlin "possesses laboratories and museums on a palatial scale, and a perfect army of investigators and students supported by State endowment." Contrasting England's small provision for scientific research, he turned to the criticism of Oxford and Cambridge. Particularly bitter were several passages dealing with the diversion of endowments by the colleges from the scientific purposes intended by the donors, and he cited names and instances.

Meanwhile the Devonshire Commission was issuing its reports. The Third Report, largely devoted to Oxford and Cambridge, drew a direct contrast between the schedules of courses at the two English universities and colleges with that of the University of Berlin (Third Report, XV-XXVI). Though noting the recent advances made, the Commissioners concluded that teaching in the sciences was inadequate, requiring a greater "plurality of teachers" in order to achieve a necessary "breadth and depth of instruction." They further recommended, and called attention to this recommendation again in their Seventh Report of two years later, that the degree of Doctor in Science be instituted for which original research should be made a requirement (as in the German universities), a requirement also recommended to be made conditional to the awarding of fellowships (Third Report, LIX; Seventh Report, 3).

The reports of the Devonshire and other parliamentary commissions of the 1870's and the various attacks aided in bringing about some reform in the ancient universities through the adoption of the New Statutes of 1881 (Tillyard, p. 225). But they probably contributed also to the founding of the new institutions of higher learning. For it is more than likely that few of the middle-class industrialists had any conception earlier of the true situation existing in the sciences and technologies in the old universities. Partly, since many were Dissenters, they distrusted the universities as the home of Anglicanism; yet it was not until the religious tests were abolished at Oxford and Cambridge that they founded the city colleges. More significant is the fact that without exception the new institutions stressed the sciences and all included laboratory work from the outset. In any event it was not until the attacks on the two universities became general and the fear of German competition was aroused that English industrialists founded and supported institutions of higher learning in which a curriculum better adapted to meet the needs of an industrial society and less expensively addicted to

the delights of high living and light learning would predominate.[27]

The dates of the founding of the new colleges tell their own tale: Armstrong College, Newcastle-on-Tyne (a branch of Durham University), 1871; Yorkshire College of Science, Leeds, 1874; College of Science for the West of England, Bristol, 1876; Firth College, Sheffield, 1879; Mason's College of Science, Birmingham, 1880; Nottingham College of Science, 1881; and University College, Liverpool, 1882.[28] With the exception of Nottingham, all of these colleges were affiliated with medical schools having facilities for clinical instruction.[29]

One of the first who had responded to the new impulse was Henry Roscoe, the German-trained chemist of Owens College. Stimulated by the report of the Taunton Commission, Roscoe with Principal Greenwood of Owens College visited Germany and Switzerland in 1868 to study the universities and polytechnical higher schools.[30] Upon his return he wrote two articles for *Nature*. In the first he contrasted the so-called "free" English system of university education with the German. In the latter the universities were open "without limitation of number [or] religious test of any kind, and for the payment of ridiculously low fees." He stressed also the excellence of the German physical, chemical, and physiological laboratories, and the connection of the medical schools both with hospitals, as in England, and with the universities.[31] In the second on "The Polytechnical Schools," he questioned the separation of the technical from the purely scientific, quoting Liebig in support of his doubts (*Nature*, I, 475-477). Probably it was due to his effort that the Manchester Council of Arts Society resolved "That the best interests of the country demand the establishment of a complete system of science classes under a responsible department of the Government, and under a definite plan, and especially the establishment of science col-

27 Bishop Gore in the House of Lords called Oxford "a playground for the sons of the wealthier classes." Quoted by Tillyard, p. 241. Max Müller described them as "finishing schools for the well-to-do," a phrase quoted approvingly by E. Ray Lankester, *Nature*, XIV (1876), 128. See also "Liberal Education in England," *Edinburgh Review*, CXXVII (1868), 131-165.

28 M. E. Sadler, ed., *Continuation Schools in England and Elsewhere* (Manchester, 1907), p. 74; Armytage, *Civic Universities*, passim.

29 *British Medical Journal*, II (1883), 457-501, gives full information on their programs, facilities, etc. Nottingham was unique also in being supported and supervised by the municipality.

30 See the Second Report of the Commission on Technical Education, *Parliamentary Papers*, 1884 [C. 3981 — III] XXXI, 437.

31 *Nature*, I (1869), 157-159. Neither at Oxford nor Cambridge were there adequate facilities for a medical school until at least the close of this period. See Michael Foster, *On Medical Education at Cambridge* (London, 1878), p. 8, where he writes: "There are no lectures whatever on the Theory and Practice of Surgery, on Midwifery, on Medical Jurisprudence, or on Sanitary Science. In Addenbrooke's Hospital there are I understand no dresserships or clinical clerkships, no practical offices in fact which can be held by students . . ." See also "Medical Study at Oxford," by J. B. S[anderson?], *Nature*, XXXIII (1886), 455-456.

leges in the principal industrial centers of the United Kingdom" (*Nature*, I [1869], 239). Roscoe set to work also to improve the facilities of Owens College to prepare it to assume full university rank, perhaps the easier in Manchester because the "German influence was very strong there" (Armytage, *Civic Universities*, p. 224). Success came when in 1880 Owens College was chartered as Victoria University with the understanding that Leeds and Liverpool would shortly become other colleges of the new university.

The beginnings of another college are traced to the visit to the Paris Exhibition of Thomas Nussey of Leeds whose report urged the need of technical education in England (Armytage, *Civic Universities*, p. 227). Two years later G. H. Nussey and A. Nussey founded the Leeds Art and Science Institute from which developed the Yorkshire College of Science.[32] At Bristol, the circular calling a meeting in 1874 to discuss the founding of a university college read: "It is generally admitted that the prosperity of British industry must in future greatly depend upon the proper scientific and technical training of those by whom the commerce and manufactures of the country will be carried out" (Armytage, *Civic Universities*, p. 223).

Following the example already set by Owens College and the two London colleges, the new institutions were organized more on the Scottish and German than the English university model in having professorial teaching; being city colleges, they had rarely any boarding houses. To claim in each instance direct German influence would be preposterous. But the widely and continuously cited German example, the intensively fostered fear of German industrial competition, and the German experience of many of the leading teachers played important roles in providing an impulse, otherwise so long delayed as to be almost inexplicable.[33] Many of the new colleges had their start as mechanics' institutes, and so marked was the preoccupation with the sciences and technical training that even the leading exponents of scientific instruction felt called upon occasionally to protest.

For despite the bitterness of their attacks upon the ancient universities, it is worth recalling that none of the leaders in this movement were irresponsible fanatics or radical politicians. They were not carried away by Saint-Simonian or Comtean dreams of a state directed by scientists or an intellectual élite, and if they had little patience with what

[32] A more detailed account appears in Sir Edward Thorpe, *Sir Henry Enfield Roscoe* (London, 1916), pp. 53 ff.

[33] See J. A. Froude's letter, quoted in Herbert Paul, *Life of Froude* (London, 1905), p. 224, written from Cornell University at Ithaca, N. Y., on the contrast between the English and American use of wealth.

they dubbed metaphysics or mysticism, none among them deprecated the humanities or liberal arts in the curriculum of either colleges or universities. More than once Lockyer reiterated what he wrote upon the inauguration of the Yorkshire College of Science. "We do not want a Yorkshire College of Science, but a Yorkshire College in which science will be found in its proper place. It must be remembered that the whole duty of these local colleges is not limited to the instruction in the particular sciences which more directly relate to the manufacturing industries of the districts in which they are placed; they must act as *nuclei* for higher culture by the establishment of chairs of Art and Literature."[34] The scientists continually urged also the importance of providing facilities for research as well as for instruction. If this was true of the scientists who were not Oxford or Cambridge men, it must be unnecessary to add that this was the position of men such as Arnold, Pattison, Jowett, Brodie, and others. What they were all combatting was the ignorance of the many and blind subservience to the past, while simultaneously attempting to raise the standards and extend the curriculum of education generally. By failing to maintain a position of intellectual leadership in the advancement of the sciences, Cambridge and Oxford had neglected their national responsibilities. The German competition and the German example compelled reform and the founding of supplementary institutions. For it was the genuine achievements of the Germans that rendered them an object of envy, as it was the complacency of the English that rendered German competition a danger.

III

In J. Reynolds Green's *A History of Botany in the United Kingdom*, the heading for the chapter dealing with the two decades 1870-90 is "The Coming of the Laboratory."[35] This innovation, with the introduction of original investigation in the more advanced institutions, marked a turning point in scientific instruction in England. For the coming of the laboratory was not restricted to botanical study. Though the principal sciences had been represented by professorships in the English universi-

[34] *Nature*, XI (1874-75), 509. See also L. Playfair, *Nature*, XXXII (1885), 445; Thomas H. Huxley, "Introductory Address on University and Medical Training," *British Medical Journal*, II (1874), 464-466, and "A Liberal Education" in *Science and Education* (New York, 1894), p. 97.

[35] J. Reynolds Green, *A History of Botany in the United Kingdom* . . . (London, 1914), Ch. LIII.

ties, the teaching, when any at all was performed, was either wholly theoretical, with occasional demonstrations, or, if devoted at all to "practical work" (not required for a degree), took place in one of the very few existing teaching laboratories, which were cramped and poorly equipped. Despite the recommendations of the Royal Commissions for the Universities of the 1850's, little had been accomplished towards increasing or improving science instruction before 1867 (Haines, Ch. IV). Such laboratories as existed in the two ancient universities, the two London colleges, Owens College, or the London and provincial hospitals were suitable only for elementary instruction, when their use was not restricted to the instructors.[36]

Immediately after 1867 the change began. The German-trained G. D. Liveing had by his own efforts introduced chemistry as an experimental science at Cambridge and Robert Bellamy Clifton had introduced experimental physics at Oxford. The first encouragement officially given to experimental teaching and research, in addition to the Museum at Oxford, more a museum than a laboratory, was the building of the Clarendon Laboratory there and the Cavendish Laboratory at Cambridge. A few of the colleges at Oxford and Cambridge founded small laboratories as well. After he had been teaching several years, a physiological laboratory was instituted in the later 1870's for Michael Foster at Cambridge, and one was built for J. Burdon-Sanderson upon his appointment to Oxford in 1882. After delays and difficulties, botanical laboratories also appeared and in 1885 at Cambridge a laboratory for organic chemistry was founded. To staff the last, a German organic chemist, S. Ruhemann, was brought in on the recommendation of August von Hofmann of Berlin.[37] At the London colleges the laboratories were enlarged and the University of London founded a laboratory of pathology in which Burdon-Sanderson, E. Klein, and Victor Horsley, among others, worked.[38] New science buildings with laboratories were erected in the early 1870's by Owens College (*Nature*, II [1870], 449-450), and the new colleges, consciously scientific in orientation, provided laboratories of sorts from the beginning.

Even the erection of laboratories could not, however, solve England's problems in science instruction at once. Adequately prepared

[36] See the letter by Edward Frankland in *Nature*, III (1870-71), 445, quoted in part in Haines, pp. 53-54.

[37] A detailed survey of laboratory teaching facilities in the early eighties was made by the Royal Commission on Technical Education. See the Second Report in *Parliamentary Papers*, 1884 (C. 3981) XXXI, Vol. I, Part III. On Ruhemann, see J. G. Crowther, *Social Relations of Science* (London, 1941), pp. 480-481.

[38] On the physiological and pathological laboratories, see *Nature*, XXXV (1886-87), 409-410.

teachers and students were both lacking. The difficulties confronting the older universities as well as the new colleges in introducing anything beyond elementary work may be illustrated by the result of the work of J. Clerk Maxwell as professor of experimental physics in the new Cavendish Laboratory. During the six years of his teaching (1874-79) only a few students worked in the laboratory.[39] Attendance at his lectures was greater, particularly in the early years, but in 1878, we are told, two or three students attended and the following year two only, an Englishman and an American. The reason is obvious. Few English students were prepared to understand advanced work and Maxwell "had too much learning and too much originality to be at his best in elementary teaching."[40]

Neither was a laboratory of much use to the trained scientist in charge if he had to devote all his time to elementary or any other kind of teaching.[41] As a writer in *Nature* observed: "Now . . . we have a goodly number of chemical schools rising up, with in many cases professors trained in German laboratories. But in many of these the professor . . . has too much routine teaching and too little time for original work."[42]

In the natural sciences, the situation was very different from that in chemistry: physiology, zoology, and botany were hardly modern sci-

39 Maxwell's teaching began in 1872, but the laboratory was not open until 1874. Sir J. J. Thomson, "James Clerk Maxwell" in *James Clerk Maxwell: a Commemoration Volume* (Cambridge, 1931), mentions the names of ten laboratory students. In the same volume Sir R. T. Glazebrook, "Early Days at the Cavendish Laboratory," names three others; and William Garnett, "Maxwell's Laboratory," mentions three more. When J. H. Thomson took charge of the department in 1885, the number of students, we are told, was "about ten," and this was after the five years during which Lord Rayleigh, much more of an experimentalist than Maxwell, had been in charge. See Alexander Wood, *The Cavendish Laboratory* (Cambridge, 1946), p. 30. However, 45 students were reported doing elementary work in the laboratory by the Commissioners on Technical Education in 1881. See their Second Report, Vol. 1, p. 420.

40 The numbers and quotations are from "Some Memories" by Sir Ambrose Fleming in *James Clerk Maxwell*, p. 121. In the same volume cf. Thomson, pp. 15-16; and Sir Horace Lamb, "Clerk Maxwell as Lecturer," p. 144. See also *Nature*, XII (1875), 204; "the magnificent laboratories of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge and Dublin are nearly empty."

41 *Nature*, XXVIII (1883), 614. Argument was continuous between the supporters of the secondary schools and the universities whether one or other was to blame for the lack of science education, each blaming the other. The Devonshire Commission in its Sixth Report stated that of the 128 secondary schools examined less than one half had attempted to introduce instruction in the sciences, that only thirteen possessed any laboratories, and only ten allowed as much as four hours a week to science instruction. See *Nature*, XI (1875), 509.

42 Of the chemistry teachers in England during these two decades, the following were German-trained or studied under German-trained teachers: At Mason's College, W. A. Tilden (A. von Hofmann); Cambridge University, George D. Liveing (Rammelsberg), James Dewar (Playfair, Kekulé), S. Ruhemann (A. von Hofmann); University College, Bristol, William Ramsay (Bunsen, Fittig); Cirencester Agricultural College, J. C. A. Voelcker (Liebig); Yorkshire College of Science, Leeds, T. E. Thorpe (Roscoe, Bunsen); King's College, London, William A. Miller (Liebig), C. L. Bloxam (A. von Hofmann), J. Millar Thomson (Playfair); University College, London, Alexander Williamson (Gmelin, Liebig); Central Technical College, London, Henry E. Armstrong (Frankland, Kolbe); Finsbury Technical College, Raphael Meldola (Frankland);

ences as practised in England before 1867.[43] What was particularly required was a new group of men with a vision of these as experimental sciences. The Germans furnished the vision and a notable group of men, aware of the German experimental methods and the German achievements, or trained themselves in German laboratories, appeared.

Thomas Huxley was a remarkable figure in the English scientific scene of the mid-years of the century. Apart from his support of Darwin and his campaign in behalf of technical education, he was almost singular in the character of his scientific interest. "There was very little of the genuine naturalist in me," he wrote. "I never collected anything and species work was a burden to me. What I cared for was the architectural and engineering part of the business" (Green, p. 527). How revelatory this is of the generally prevailing conception of the natural scientist in mid-Victorian England: the naturalist was a collector and systematist, and that was the sum total of his "science." Huxley's very different interest made him seek to understand the functional as well as formal relationships and, stimulated by his reading in Johannes Müller and Karl von Baer,[44] he was led inevitably into the experimental laboratory and to dissatisfaction with a teaching method which beside the lectures consisted at the most of demonstrations. The result was his founding of the "great course" in biology at South Kensington in 1871, the course which, in Green's words, "Coming as it did side by side with the dawning influence of the German school . . . prepared the way for a total revolution in the methods of botanical study" (Green, p. 528) and, as will appear, for something similar in the study of physiology and zoology.

Until 1870 there were few teaching laboratories in physiology. Largely responsible for the few existing was William Sharpey (1802-80). A graduate of the University of Edinburgh in medicine, as were

School of Mines, Edward A. Frankland (Bunsen, Liebig); Owens College, Manchester, Henry E. Roscoe (Bunsen), Carl Schorlemmer (Bunsen, H. Will, H. Kopp); Oxford University, B. C. Brodie (Liebig); Woolwich Military College, Frederick A. Abel (A. von Hofmann). This list makes no pretense to completeness.

43 See Haines, pp. 52-54. Matthew Arnold commented that "In nothing do England and the Continent at the present moment more strikingly differ than in the prominence which is now given to the idea of science there, and the neglect in which this idea still lies here; a neglect so great that we hardly know the use of the word science in its strict sense, and only employ it in a secondary and incorrect sense" (Arnold, pp. 278-279). Cf. Sir Edward Sharpey-Schafer, "Development of Physiology," *Nature*, CIV (1914), 207-208.

44 Leonard Huxley, *Life and Letters of Thomas Henry Huxley* (New York, 1900), I, 112: "For the difference between this [Huxley's work] and the labours of the greatest English comparative anatomist of the time, whose detailed work was of the highest value, but whose generalizations and speculations . . . proved barren and fruitless, lay in the fact that Huxley . . . had taken up the method of von Baer and Johannes Müller, then almost unknown, or at least unused in England." See also I, 9.

so many of the British experimental scientists in the early nineteenth century, Sharpey studied afterwards in Paris with Dupuytren, at the University of Berlin with Rudolphi, and at Heidelberg with Tiedemann. After teaching at Edinburgh, Sharpey became professor of physiology at University College, London.[45] Determined to institute laboratory teaching, he first persuaded George Harley, who had worked in Paris with Claude Bernard, to start such a class. But Harley's practice as a physician led him to give up the enterprise and Sharpey turned to one of his students, Michael Foster, whom he induced to give up the practice of medicine for the purpose. Foster's appointment to University College, London, according to Sharpey-Schafer "proved a decisive factor in the history of physiology in England" (Sharpey-Schafer, p. 2). Together with Sharpey, Foster toured the Continental laboratories to study the work being done in France and Germany. The success of his laboratory class encouraged a few others to similar undertakings. Among them was F. William Pavy (1829-1911), another student of Bernard's, at Guy's Hospital; and Foster's successor at University College, John Burdon-Sanderson (1828-1905). The latter was also an Edinburgh M.D. who had studied with Gerhardt and Würtz, embryology with Coste, and physiology with Bernard (Sharpey-Schafer, pp. 22,28). The importance of the work of the physiologists in Germany appeared, however, not only in its own subject-matter or in relation to medicine, but also in relation to botany, zoology, and psychology, and it was perhaps with the last especially in mind that George Henry Lewes, himself familiar with the German work, and George Eliot suggested to their friend the philologist W. G. Clark the need of establishing experimental physiology at Cambridge. Clark, G. M. Humphrey, George Paget, and Coutts Trotter, the last of whom had studied with Helmholtz, persuaded Trinity College to found a praelectorship in physiology. At Huxley's suggestion Michael Foster was appointed to the post.[46] Few appointments have more profoundly influenced the future of a university or a subject.

But Foster's work was also to profit from Huxley's "great course." Designed to provide science teachers for the elementary schools resulting from the Education Act of 1870, the course was given for the first time in the summer of 1871 on the ground floor of the yet unfinished

[45] Sir Edward Sharpey-Schafer, *History of the Physiological Society during its First Fifty Years, 1876-1926* (London, 1927), p. 14.

[46] Sharpey-Schafer, p. 3 and n. 2. Trotter became Foster's principal supporter at Cambridge. See Foster's obituary notice on Trotter in *Nature*, XXXVII (1887), 153-154.

South Kensington Museum. Consisting of an hour's lecture in the morning followed by four hours of laboratory work in the afternoon, Huxley delivered a systematic course of lectures and brought in a number of assistants for the laboratory period.[47] The course's significance is not that it was the first in which laboratory teaching was employed in the natural sciences in England (Huxley, I, note to p. 406). Though one of the first, the "great course" was distinctive for its inclusion of both plants and animals, for a systematic use of types of organisms, and in giving more considerable attention to microscopic forms. Of still greater importance, however, was the guidance and opportunity the course afforded to the remarkable group of men brought in as laboratory instructors. Among the first were Michael Foster, William Rutherford, and E. Ray Lankester; later, when it had become an established course with the transfer of the School of Mines to South Kensington, came William Thiselton-Dyer, Newell Martin, Sidney Vines, and others (Green, pp. 528 ff.).

The direct result of the course and of the German influence was the founding of two important centers of botanical study in England: at Cambridge and at Kew Gardens. To these may be added the Oxford school, though it did not attain to the importance of the other two. Another result was that the course promoted and contributed to the success of the Cambridge school of physiology and zoology. More generally, it may be said to have revolutionized the teaching of the natural sciences in England by inaugurating the training of a professoriate in the biological sciences for the United Kingdom and the Dominions.

After Claude Bernard's laboratory, itself of first importance, the great center of physiological study in Europe was the laboratory of Carl Ludwig. With him many of England's leading physiologists studied.[48] And it was frequently from the Cambridge school of physiology founded by Michael Foster[49] that these students went to the Continent.[50] Of the

47 Huxley, I, 406-407; Green, p. 528; F. O. Bower, *Sixty Years of Botany in Britain (1875-1935)* (London, 1938), pp. 45-46.

48 Among them were Lauder Brunton, William Rutherford, H. N. Moseley, E. Ray Lankester, William Stirling, W. H. Gaskell, J. T. Cash, Meade Smith, L. C. Woolridge, C. E. Beevor, G. A. Buckmaster, W. H. Thomson, Vaughan Harley, and Arthur Gamgee. See William Stirling, "In Memoriam — Carl Ludwig," *The Medical Chronicle*, Manchester, N.S. III (Apr.-Sept., 1895), 178-191; and "Gamgee, Arthur," *DNB*.

49 Sharpey-Schafer, pp. 24-25. For the difficulties under which Foster labored, see Lankester's review of Francis Balfour's *Comparative Anatomy*, *Nature*, XXV (1881), 26-27.

50 Among the Cambridge men, Newell Martin's career took him to the Johns Hopkins University; Francis Balfour, who worked with Dohrn at Naples, died at the outset of a Cambridge professorship; W. H. Gaskell and J. N. Langley remained at Cambridge, the latter succeeding Foster; C. S. Roy studied in Berlin, Strasbourg and Leipzig before becoming professor of pathology at Cambridge; Henry Head went to Liverpool, and Charles Sherrington to Oxford.

older men, J. Burdon-Sanderson's background has already been noted; he went from University College, London, to Oxford. E. Ray Lankester had also extensive foreign training, having studied with Rokitansky at Vienna and Dohrn at the Naples Biological Station, as well as with Ludwig. His teaching career, after a short period at Oxford, continued at University College, London, followed by a return to Oxford, and finally to the British Institution, London ("Lankester, Edwin Ray," *DNB*).

Due to Huxley's illness, in 1873 W. Thiselton-Dyer, assisted by Lawson, professor of botany at Oxford, had charge of the course at South Kensington and gave additional attention to the botanical side. To indicate the source of his inspiration, his own words are best:

> At the time I shared the general belief that the manipulative difficulties were so great in demonstrating things to be seen in [German] textbooks that only men like Hofmeister could accomplish it. I was shaken in this belief at the British Association in Edinburgh in 1871, when Prof. A. Dickson had a remarkable exhibit. . . . He was, I think, the first of our botanists to get an inspiration in original work from Germany. . . . I was very keen to demonstrate what Hofmeister had done. . . . It would have seemed hopeless if Casimir de Candolle had not come to England after working with Strasburger, and brought a number of preparations with him. He showed me that the difficulties were not insuperable.
>
> (Quoted by Green, pp. 530-532)

The leading figures in botany in Germany were W. Hofmeister, who died in 1876, H. A. de Bary at Strasbourg, and J. von Sachs at Würtzburg. The principal founders of scientific botany in England studied either at Strasbourg or Würtzburg and often at both.[51]

In 1875 Thiselton-Dyer became Assistant Director of Kew Gardens under his father-in-law, Joseph Dalton Hooker. There he was instrumental in inaugurating the study of physiological botany which led ultimately to the founding of the Jodrell Laboratory at Kew. Many English botanists worked with him at one time or another, including McNab, afterwards professor at Dublin, and Hick, who went to Manchester (Green, pp. 531 ff.; Bower, pp. 48 ff.).

Associated with Thiselton-Dyer at Kensington in 1874 was Sydney Vines who had studied at Cambridge with Foster. After he began teaching at Cambridge himself, he studied both at Strasbourg and Würtzburg. Vines' success at Cambridge equalled that of Foster, who aided him as much as possible, even providing him with laboratory space he could himself ill afford to spare. As Demonstrator, responsible for both the lectures and laboratory work as late as 1880, Vines was finally promoted to Reader. But when in 1887 Bailey Balfour went to

51 Among others were Sydney Vines, Bailey Balfour, Francis Darwin, H. M. Ward, F. O. Bower, W. R. McNab, Walter Gardiner, and D. H. Scott. See Green, pp. 531 ff., and Bower, pp. 48 ff.

Edinburgh and Oxford offered Vines the professorship of botany, he accepted since the erstwhile professor of botany at Cambridge, Charles Babbington, though no longer either residing or lecturing, was still living. In the meantime, Vines had created a flourishing department with the assistance, after 1882, of Francis Darwin.[52]

It was not, however, only directly through study in Germany that the German influence operated; the texts in the natural sciences were for many years almost exclusively in German or were translations from that language.[53] One of Thiselton-Dyer's important contributions was to edit in 1875 Bennett's translation of Sach's *Lehrbuch* (Green, p. 534; Bower, p. 53); and Ward published in 1887 a translation of Sach's *Lectures on Physiology* (Green, p. 54). In 1885 Vines and Bower published a *Handbook of Practical Botany* and the following year Vines' *Physiology of Plants* appeared, "the first contribution of an Englishman to the new botanical literature" (Green, p. 546; Bower, pp. 29-30). To mark their new departures, the new schools founded also their own journals. In 1878 Foster started the *Journal of Physiology* (Sharpey-Schafer, pp. 26-27); and in 1887 Balfour and Vines initiated the *Annals of Botany*.[54] Partly to counter the anti-vivisectionist agitation, the leaders in physiology founded in 1876 the Physiological Society.[55]

One of the triumphs of the biologists was almost wholly the result of E. Ray Lankester's efforts. As we have seen, he and a number of other English zoologists had studied with the German Dohrn at the Naples Marine Biological Station. Following a fisheries exhibition, Lankester began an agitation for an English marine biological station, such as the leading Continental states already had. Lockyer promptly supported the proposal in *Nature*, and at the suggestion of Dr. Günther of the British Museum the Marine Biological Association was founded with Huxley as president and Lankester as secretary. The Association

52 Of Vines' students, Ward succeeded Babbington in the chair at Cambridge; Bower went to Glasgow; Phillips, to Bangor; Percival, to Wye and Reading; Oliver, to University College, London; Groom, to the Imperial College of Science; Green, to Liverpool. Of Darwin's students, Burkhill went to Singapore; Willis, to Ceylon; Pearson, to Capetown; Bottomley, to King's College, London. Biffen held a post at Cambridge; Yapp went to Aberystwyth; Vaughan, to Belfast; and Blackman, to the Imperial College of Science. See Green, passim.

53 *Nature*, XVIII (1878), 611; XXV (1881), 25-26; XXXII (1885), 193.

54 Bower, pp. 60-64. I. Bayley Balfour graduated from Edinburgh, studied with Sachs and de Bary, assisted both Huxley and Lister. He was successively professor of botany at Glasgow, Oxford, and Edinburgh, reforming the study in all three. See Bower, Ch. III, and Green, p. 547.

55 Sharpey-Schafer, pp. 5 ff. Of the nineteen men listed as the first movers of the Society, eight had studied in Germany: Sharpey, G. H. Lewes, Brunton, Pye-Smith, Gaskell, E. Klein, F. Darwin, and G. F. Yeo. Huxley, Foster, and Foster's students, John Marshall and Sharpey-Schafer, were strongly influenced by German concepts and practice. Two others, Pavy and Burdon-Sanderson, had, as already noted, studied in France.

raised a considerable sum of money by subscription with the participation of the City Companies. Finally, the government was persuaded to contribute £5,000 and to supply an annual subsidy of £500. The result was the founding of the Plymouth Biological Station in 1887 with G. C. Bourne, who had studied in the laboratory of the German A. Weismann, Freiburg in the Breisgau, as first director.[56]

During the two decades under review, as a result of strong German influence, England began to lay the foundations for education in science and technology. English scientists ceased to be largely amateurs, and the leaders in the professionalization of the sciences were usually either German-trained or conscious of following German leadership. Before the founding of the new colleges and laboratories, opportunities of employment for experimental scientists were, even in teaching, so few as to discourage all but the ablest and most determined. But despite this gradual development of a professoriate in the sciences, a lack of technologists and a widespread indifference to the advantage of employing them was still to characterize English industry for many years to come.[57]

IV

When a new depression in trade began in 1884, the business community and the politicians became for the first time seriously alarmed by the competition of Germany. Nearly two decades of ceaseless preaching on the theme of German science and education and its effect upon industry was making a serious impression. Businessmen began to demand consular assistance to traders abroad; they developed a greater interest in trade with the colonies. In the face of the new tariffs of Germany and France, a Fair Trade movement, urging tariff retaliation, gained momentum in England. In 1887 Parliament was persuaded to pass the Merchandise Marks Act, which put the famous mark "Made in Germany" on all goods manufactured there. It was expected to reveal the inferiority of German-made goods. The English were instead shocked to discover

[56] See *Nature*, XXX (1884), 25, 40, 123, 350-351; XXXIV (1886), 177-181; XXXVIII (1888), 198-201, 236-237.

[57] Alfred Marshall, *Industry and Trade* (London, 1927), p. 95, observed that "English business men were slow to recognize a chief cause of decline in their industrial leadership. But about 1904 [I] they began to see clearly that they must follow other nations in promoting industrial efficiency by improved education."

how widely and successfully German-made goods were competing even in the home market (Hoffman, pp. 28 ff.).

Willing as the businessmen were to call upon government for assistance in some ways, however, many of them doubtless agreed with the remarks made by a physician, P. H. Pye-Smith, in an address to the British Association for the Advancement of Science in 1879.

> With regard to the endowment of research in biology, I must confess that I should be sorry to see it undertaken by government funds. That such investigations are of public interest, that they are difficult and expensive, and that at present they languish for want of adequate support, is all true. . . . [but] Great as is the national importance of science, the nation is more important still; and even if that were the alternative, I would rather that we should indefinitely continue dependent on Germany for our knowledge than give up the local energy, the unofficial zeal which has made England what she is. Far better for the strength and civilisation of the nation that a thousand pounds were raised every year for the endowment of unremunerative researches in this wealthy town of Sheffield than that ten thousand were paid you by a paternal monarch or an enlightened department.[58]

Such sentiments were echoed in Parliament whenever the subjects were broached.

Equally influential, perhaps, was the opinion referred to incidentally by Lankester and early expressed in Parliament by Samuelson: "The notion [in this country] that science is dreamy, vague, untrustworthy, and useless to practical men."[59] In view of the fact that the teaching of science exclusively as theoretical knowledge had been the practice of the universities and with but two or three exceptions of other schools as well, to what other conclusion could the practical men have come? Because science instruction had been divided between the highest realm of theoretical discovery and the simplest realm of techniques suitable to the artisan, as taught in the mechanics' institutes or such "polytechnics" as Quintin Hogg's in Regent Street, because of the low estate of the technologies in England, science had in actual fact tended to be "dreamy and untrustworthy" for practical ends. And only very slowly was this view of English science becoming out-dated.

For despite the founding of the university colleges and the new laboratories of the universities, the effect of the fear of German commercial competition was principally to focus attention upon the more immediately and discernably profitable technical education. Technical

58 *Nature*, XX (1879), 408-413. Pye-Smith had himself studied both in Vienna and Berlin. This represents the sole expression of such opinion by a trained scientist that I have been able to find except for a letter written by Alfred R. Wallace, if he can be described as trained, protesting the use of public funds for scientific purposes. See *Nature*, I (1869), 288-289.

59 E. Ray Lankester, *The Advancement of Science* (London, 1890), p. 199.

education was popular with businessmen and politicians and salved the social consciences of the philanthropists. In terms of effort expended, probably the greatest advance made in the period was in technical education, especially at the secondary level.

As Playfair had begun the agitation in 1867 which led to the appointment of the Select Committee on Technical Education on which Samuelson served in 1868, so Mundella was instrumental in beginning the agitation which led to the Royal Commission on Technical Instruction in 1881.[60] He began by working through Philip Magnus. Upon returning from study at the University of Berlin, where he had learned to admire the German educational system, Magnus had been appointed Organising Director and Secretary of the City and Guilds London Institute, a key position for the promotion of technical education.[61] The following year Mundella urged him to submit to the committee of the City Guilds Institute a manuscript written by a friend living in Chemnitz, H. M. Felkin, with the request that they publish it. Successful in this, the work appeared in May of 1881 under the title of *Technical Education in a Saxon Town*. "What will strike everyone who carefully examines the figures contained in the following pages is the great cost of a well-organised system of technical instruction," wrote Magnus in the preface. "It remains to be seen whether, for the sake of increasing the industrial prosperity of this country, the people of England will be willing to make corresponding sacrifices."[62]

Mundella used the book to persuade the government to appoint a royal commission to make inquiries into the conditions of education in foreign countries, with special reference to its bearing on industrial pursuits.[63] Appointed to serve on the commission were: Bernhard Samuelson, as chairman, Henry Roscoe, Philip Magnus, John Slagg, Swire Smith, William Woodall, with Gilbert Redgrave as secretary.[64] The Royal Commission on Technical Instruction worked for three years,

60 Something of the reason for it is revealed in a statement Mundella made in the Commons. "I had seen what Germany was doing 20 years before [last autumn]; but I must confess that I was perfectly astounded at the development which has been made in the last seven or ten years. My hon. Friend . . . spoke of an institution [in England] which is to cost £20,000 or £30,000 to build. There are institutions which have been established within the last four years abroad which have cost as much as £100,000, compared with which there is nothing at all in this country." Hansard, 3rd Series, CCLX (1880), 539.

61 Sir Philip Magnus, *Educational Aims and Efforts, 1880-1910* (London, 1910), pp. 14, 50, 51.

62 Magnus, p. 91. The book was reviewed by Bernard Samuelson in the *Fortnightly Review*, N.S. XXX (July-Dec., 1881), 92-97, who attributed the German success in taking the glove trade away from Nottingham to lower wages rather than to the admittedly superior technical education.

63 Magnus, p. 92; Hansard, 3rd Series, CCLX (1880), 527-548.

64 Samuelson represented iron and machinery; John Slagg, cotton; Smith, wool; Roscoe, chemicals; Woodall,

issuing a final report in three parts in 1884, one on American education by William Mather, another on Agricultural Instruction by H. M. Jenkins, and the third on scientific instruction and trade schools on the continent.[65] According to Magnus, the report "was widely circulated . . . and was for many years the recognised work of reference on all questions of technical education" (Magnus, p. 94). But the Commissioners did not permit the matter to rest there. "From 1884 onwards, during many years, the members of the Commission, more especially Sir Henry Roscoe, Sir Swire Smith, the late Mr. Woodall and myself," wrote Magnus, "addressed large meetings in nearly every manufacturing centre throughout the country."[66] Though other countries were not neglected, as had happened before Germany again played a stellar role in the report.[67]

An account of the advance made in technical education, much of which consisted of the founding of night schools for workers, often on the foundations of the old mechanics' institutes, partly financed through the Science and Art Department, would take us far from our immediate interest. The most ambitious undertakings were those of the City and Guilds Institute, founded by the Livery Companies and other guilds and by the Corporation of the City of London.[68] The first of their undertakings was the Finsbury Technical School, 1878, a precursor to the Central Technical College, a teacher-training technical school, founded in 1884.[69] Besides these, the Institute encouraged the founding of technical schools by donations, as in the founding in 1883 of the Manchester Technical School (Magnus, p. 231 and note; Millis, pp. 67 ff.). The curriculum in these institutions generally reflected the industrial interests of the local community.[70]

A demand for commercial education, as well as the more strictly technical, resulted from the Report of the Royal Commission on the Depression of Trade and Industry in 1885. The following year, when a proposal to establish an Imperial Institute was made as part of the cele-

pottery; Magnus, technical education; and Redgrave, the Science and Art Department. See Sir Swire Smith, *The Real German Rivalry* (London, 1916), pp. 23 ff. Also, Armytage, *Mundella*, p. 209.

65 The Commission's reports appeared in 1882 and 1884. The one of particular interest here is the Second Report, Vol. I, in *Parliamentary Papers*, 1884 [C. 3981], XXIX.

66 Magnus, pp. 94-95, lists 39 towns besides London in which he alone spoke. Cf. Thorpe, pp. 152-153.

67 All of the First Report was devoted to France. A good summary of the Report is given in *Nature*, XXX (1884), 113-114.

68 Magnus, p. 85; and C. T. Millis, *Technical Education* (London, 1925), pp. 53 ff. See also S. J. Curtis, *History of Education in Great Britain* (London, 1953), pp. 481 ff.

69 Magnus, pp. 87, 97; Millis, p. 61; *Nature*, XXIV (1881), 262-263.

70 See Philip Magnus, *Fragments* (London, 1933), pp. 148-149, 151-155.

bration of the Jubilee year, the scientific, technical, and commercial interests came into conflict. Lockyer vigorously urged the cause of the sciences as necessarily related to industry. But not even the appointment of the chemist Sir Frederick Abel as organizing secretary of the committee in charge availed to make of it a great technological institute, as the scientists desired.[71]

While the project was under consideration, in the spring of 1887, mainly on the initiative of Roscoe, a National Association for the Promotion of Technical Education was founded. In June of that year the Association sent an impressive delegation to urge the government to provide financial support. The result was the introduction of a bill in the Commons for government assistance to technical education, but the bill was not acted upon until another two years had elapsed.[72]

The weakness of the movement for technical education was the same as that of every other movement for education in England in the nineteenth century: a great many schools were founded without systematic organization, and most of them were starved for funds due to the dissipation both of energy and money among such numbers.[73] But behind what was done, we find again that much of the driving impulse was furnished by the German example.

V

In the two decades preceding the Jubilee year, the English made real progress in scientific instruction under the German influence. However, all the informed scientists were in agreement that, despite the gains made, England was not even approaching to equality with Germany. In 1883 Lankester made a carefully detailed examination of the funds, facilities, and offices available for the study of the biological sciences in Germany and England. "In proportion to its population (leaving aside the consideration of its great wealth), England has," he concluded, "only

71 *Nature*, XXXV (1886), 217-218, 241-242, 265-266; and XXXVI (1887), 19.

72 Magnus, *Educational Aims and Efforts*, p. 111; Armytage, *Mundella*, pp. 270-271. For a more extended account, *Nature*, XXXVI (1887), 229-230.

73 In *Nature*, XXXIII (1885), 491-492, T. E. Thorpe wrote concerning technical education: "We have as yet no system. That is, of course, characteristic of us. . . . Nothing in our whole educational history is more characteristic of us — of our energy, public spirit, and independence — than the way in which with much effort, laborious and occasionally ill-directed, and with no inconsiderable expenditure of money, we are hammering away at this question of teaching technology. In Yorkshire alone there is at the present moment probably every type of technical school more or less imperfectly developed, which the ingenuity or perversity of man could devise."

about one-fourth of the provision for the advancement of biological research which exists in Germany." Estimating the financial expenditure necessary to bring England to an equality, he admitted that the proposal he was making "is gigantic and almost alarming in respect of the amount of money which it demands," adding that this "apparently extravagant and unheard of appropriation of public money *is actually made every year in Germany.*"[74]

In 1884 W. H. Perkin, one of England's most successful industrial chemists, delivered the presidential address to the Chemical Society. The former student of August von Hofmann at the old Royal College of Chemistry observed that for all the increase in facilities in England, original research was quantitatively no greater than in 1875. One reason for this was the inadequate instruction, especially in research, provided in England. Though English firms employed many fewer chemists than their German counterparts, even the few required had often to be recruited from abroad because of the insufficient training of the English students. The better English students still found it necessary to go abroad to receive really adequate schooling. "In this retrospect," he concluded, "of the work which is being carried on in relation to chemistry, it may be thought by some that an undue weight has been given to that which is being carried on in Germany, and too little to that which is being carried on in this country; but I think if anyone will impartially compare one with the other, this will not be found to be the case. . . . There is no doubt we do not hold the position we did as chemical manufacturers, and unless our chemical industries keep pace with chemical discovery fully as well as they do on the Continent, our position will further decline."[75]

It was in this year that the Royal Commission on Technical Education issued its final report in which again the contrast between the Continental, and more particularly the German, establishments were contrasted with the English, generally to the disadvantage of the latter. While something comparable, if less efficient and less well provided for, existed in England in continuation schools and universities, nothing was

[74] *Nature*, XXVIII (1883), especially pp. 520-523. Emphasis is in the original. The address was more briefly reported in the *British Medical Journal*, II (1883), 646, and collected under the title, "Biology and the State" in his *Advancement of Science*, pp. 63-117.

[75] *Nature*, XXX (1884), 246-248. Cf. Henry E. Armstrong's presidential address to the Chemical Section of the British Association at Aberdeen in *Nature*, XXXII (1885), 453. Perkin should have been well informed since two of his sons had recently studied in Germany. It is also noteworthy that already the foundations of what were to become Britain's greatest chemical industrial concerns had been laid by two German Jews who had received their scientific training in Germany: Ivan Levinstein and Ludwig Mond. See Stephen Miall, *A History of the British Chemical Industry* (London, 1931), pp. 76-77, and F. G. Donnan, *Ludwig Mond, F. R. S., 1839-1909* (London, 1939).

found to compare with the polytechnical higher schools of Germany. At no level of schooling was the quality of instruction offered in England believed to equal that in Germany. Again, too, the large financial outlay by government in Germany – an outlay which brought educational costs within the reach of virtually every student – was stressed by the Commission and the very real need of the English colleges for funds was repeated.[76]

This report was apparently widely read, perhaps because of the return of the depression in trade. Coupled with the dismaying defection of England's leading industrial competitors from the "proven economic wisdom" of free trade by the erection of tariff walls, English businessmen and politicians were more receptive than at any time in the preceding years to the warnings of the scientists and educators. This was the background for Lyon Playfair's presidental address to the British Association at Aberdeen in 1885. Although he had been speaking to the same purpose since the days of Prince Albert, whose address before the Association meeting in the same city in 1859 Playfair recalled, never before, Lockyer wrote, had the subject "attracted at any one time the same earnest and general attention." Noting the reaction to the address in some fourteen newspapers and journals, Lockyer summarized by saying that only two or three rejected Playfair's claim that England was lagging in the sciences or were "not ashamed of the condition of scientific studies in England" (*Nature*, XXXIII [1885], 497-499).

Playfair defined his object as being "to point out how it is that science lags in its progress in the United Kingdom owing to the deficient interest taken in it by the middle and upper classes." The address was remarkable for its coverage of the principal subjects of relevance. Of the lack of government responsibility, he remarked that "All great countries except England have Ministers of Education, but this country has only ministers who are managers of primary schools." Secondary education "is chaotic, and remains unconnected with the State." The universities "are still far from the attainment of a proper combination of their resources between teaching and research. Even Oxford and Cambridge, which have done so much in recent years in the equipment of laboratories and in adding to their scientific staff, are still far behind a second-class German University." Of the lack of technologists, he cor-

[76] See the Second Report of the Commission on Technical Education, and *Nature*, XXX (1884), 112-113. Smith, p. 25, was to recall later: "I must here mention the visit of the Commissioners to the chemical laboratory of the University of Munich. We saw in this laboratory, one of very many in Germany, more students taking up research and the high branches of chemistry than could have been found in all the Universities and Colleges in England put together."

rectly pointed out that "while England has never lacked leaders in science, they have too few followers to risk a rapid march. We might create an army to support our generals in science, as Germany has done . . . if education in this country would only mould itself to the needs of a scientific age." Of the effects felt in commerce, he inquired, "how is it that in our great commercial centres, foreigners – German, Swiss, Dutch, and even Greeks – push aside our English youth and take the places of profit. . . . How is it that in our colonies . . . German enterprise is pushing aside English capacity? How is it that whole branches of manufactures, when they depend on scientific knowledge, are passing away from this country. . . . The answer to these questions is that our systems of education are still too narrow for the increasing struggle for life." The sums spent by Prussia and other German states on their universities are relatively enormous by comparison to the aid given by the government of the United Kingdom. "Either all foreign States are strangely deceived in their belief that the competition of the world has become a competition of intellect, or we are marvelously unobservant of the change which is passing over Europe in the higher education of the people." "How unwise," he concluded, "it is for England to lag in the onward march of science when most other European Powers are using the resources of their States to promote higher education and to advance the boundaries of knowledge" (*Nature*, XXXIII [1885], 438-446).

The deficient interest of the middle and upper classes in the sciences and technologies can be attributed partially to simple ignorance, an ignorance which even education at the public schools or universities did little to dissipate. Of one of John Bright's speeches in which England's prosperity was attributed wholly to free trade, Lockyer commented upon the failure to take into account the contribution made by science and technology (*Nature*, XXI [1879], 296). It is therefore hardly surprising that even in the 1880's influential politicians and the Court continued to manifest an indifference to the sciences.

Probably the most moving and distressed editorial that the founder of *Nature* ever penned appeared, like the later "Recessional," on the occasion of a Jubilee. Observing that the period of the Queen's reign was historically remarkable principally for the advances made in science and technology, he noted that in England what had been accomplished was done with only a bare minimum of assistance from the State. "It is a matter of fact, whatever the origin of the fact may be, that during the Queen's reign, since the death of the lamented Prince Consort, there has been an impassable gulf between the highest culture

of the nation and Royalty itself. The brain of the nation has been divorced from the head." The lack of access to the throne of the leaders of literature, art, and science was, he believed, detrimental less to either the Queen or the notable men than to the State since the impression it gave was that these render no service to the State. Abroad, these matters were differently ordered; men of letters, art, and science were welcomed into the councils of the Sovereign. "With us it is a matter of course that every Lord Mayor shall, and every President of the Royal Society shall not, be a member of the Privy Council; and a British Barnum may pass over a threshold which is denied to a Darwin, a Stokes, or a Huxley." Blaming the courtier class, who may have obtained literary culture at the universities, "but of science or of art . . . they are for the most part ignorant," he reported that in the arrangements for the Jubilee ceremonial in Westminster Abbey only one Fellow of the Royal Society, as such, was invited, "while with regard to literature we believe not even this single exception has been made. It may be an excellent thing for men of science like Prof. Huxley, Prof. Adams, and Dr. Joule, and such a man of literature as Mr. Robert Browning, that they should not be required to attend at such a ceremonial, but it is bad for the ceremonial. . . . Her Gracious Majesty suffers when a ceremonial is rendered not only ridiculous but contemptible by such mal-administration. England is not represented, but only England's paid officials and nobodies" (*Nature*, XXXVI [1887], 145-146).

For all of Lockyer's pessimism, and much of it was warranted, he and his associates had not worked wholly in vain. Ranked below the placemen, they had little success until almost the close of this period even in arousing the business community to some sense of the danger represented by better educated nations. Almost alone in Victorian England, these scientists, scholars, and their few industrialist allies recognized the implications of the modern technologies as these were being developed and exploited especially in Germany. Influenced by the Germans both in the positive form of admiring emulation and in the negative form of fear of economic rivalry, they tried year after year to awaken their compatriots to England's need of scientific instruction and the reform and extension of education. Their success may be approximately measured by the advances made in English education in these two decades.

Connecticut College

Anthony Quinton

THE NEGLECT OF VICTORIAN PHILOSOPHY

IN A BROADCAST TALK RECENTLY one of the ablest of young British philosophers gave the following compact history of Victorian philosophy: "German idealism is said to have effected a revolution in English thought in the first half of the nineteenth century, a revolution which did not entirely eliminate its rivals, but established its ascendancy until the end of the century, when empiricism staged a rather more successful counter-revolution." In fact the brand of German idealism from which the school of Green and Bradley derived was not really introduced to the attention of British philosophers until 1865, the year in which Stirling's *The Secret of Hegel* appeared, and British idealism itself was not established until the seventies with Green's introduction to the works of Hume and Bradley's *Ethical Studies*. The remark I have quoted is simply a howler and its author's utmost disdain would have been called forth by a comparable lapse about any philosophy not so patently unfashionable. That such a mistake could be widely disseminated without correction is a sign of the neglect into which British philosophy between Hume and Russell has fallen.

The general picture of the development of philosophy with which many contemporary philosophers seem to work is simple, tidy, and remarkably exclusive. First there are the Greeks, then the long stupor of the Middle Ages, fitfully illuminated here and there with interesting bits of formal logic. Dawn, of a sort, breaks with the appearance of the great composite rationalist Descartes-Spinoza-Leibniz and the sun really gets up with Locke, Berkeley, and Hume. After Hume British phi-

losophy seems to close down entirely, with the exception of Mill, until Bradley and does not properly start up again until those two youthful Bradleians, Moore and Russell, break out of the wrappings of their philosophical education. At last God said "let Wittgenstein be" and all was light. The nineteenth century is seen as an exclusively foreign affair, given over to the fantastication of the more dubious patches of Kant, himself a serious philosopher fallen among metaphysicians. One does not need to rate the claims of the Victorian philosophers very high to feel that the later phases of this chronicle are in need of modification and that British philosophers should have some general idea of the immediate forerunners of the movement in which they proudly claim membership. Apart from anything else, as Hegel observed, if you do not study history you may have to relive it.

It is, no doubt, the analytic tendency of British philosophy during the last fifty years that is responsible for such a blithe indifference to the history of the subject. Analytic philosophers are, if anything, not so much indifferent as positively opposed to the history of philosophy for they see it as a time-consuming and intellectually low-grade substitute for serious work in the field. They have authoritative precedents for their point of view. Russell's brilliantly entertaining survey is thoroughly unhistorical, a mass of lively personal impressions of floating philosophical ideas. And where Russell is cheerfully subjective, Wittgenstein is entirely disengaged. There are hardly any names, let alone definite references, in his writings and he is reported to have found the works of Hume unreadable because there were just too many mistakes in them. It is not surprising that with these examples before them many philosophers should treat their predecessors as simply containers for interesting and timeless ideas. From this point of view when a philosopher lived or who he was influenced by is irrelevant and if such questions seem at all seductive they are dangerous since liable to lead people away from the serious business of philosophy. This attitude of neglect is fortified by the organisation of teaching which bounds lightly from Hume and Kant to Russell and Moore with no more attention to the intervening period than is required for a ritual flaying of the mistakes of poor old Mill. There really has been a revolution in philosophical method and it is natural that in their lively awareness of all the new work there is to be done, of the fresh applications that are possible for the technique of analysis, contemporary philosophers should be impatient of anything that might side-track them. But the early ardour is now cooling a little and sophisticated voices are being raised to proclaim, quite falsely, that there has been no revolution at all. The epoch of consolidation that per-

haps lies ahead will be an appropriate time for making up deficiencies of equipment.

More pressing interests are not the only reason for disregarding the history of philosophy. It is also suspect as a favourite preserve of the idealists. Idealism first appeared in England in a historical disguise, the doctrines of Hegel being mixed in to Jowett's introductions to the dialogues of Plato. Hegel has always been presented as a kind of latter-day Greek, a more public-spirited Aristotle. From Hegel on downwards idealism has been understood by its adherents as the consummation of all previous philosophy and the history of philosophy has acquired shape and significance from being seen as a process of continuous approximation to the final truth. The most recent, Crocean, version of this way of thinking identifies philosophy outright with its own history. Collingwood, for example, defines metaphysics as the historical study of the absolute presuppositions of scientific thought. But the excessive claims that have been made for the history of philosophy in identifying it with philosophy itself are not a good or sufficient reason for ignoring it altogether. Disentangled from the embraces of Hegelian metaphysics it can lead a useful and respectable life on its own.

However, as things stand, most large-scale histories of any originality or merit are idealist in inspiration. When analytic philosophers want to consult the history of their subject they must go, if they are wise, to someone like Windelband whose general history of philosophy is still, after sixty-six years, the best thing of its kind that there is. Now Windelband was a neo-Kantian and as far as he was concerned the history of philosophy came to an end with Kant and his romantic successors. His chapter on the philosophy of the nineteenth century begins: "*The history of philosophical principles* is *closed* with the development of the German systems at the boundary between the preceding [eighteenth] and present [nineteenth] centuries . . . For nothing essentially and valuably new has since appeared." The suggestion is that the truth has been found and that there is nothing left, apart from the exhumation of ancient errors, but to cherish and maintain the inheritance. A slightly odd state of affairs ensues. Empiricists who lived before Kant are accorded full respect. Did they not, after all, contribute to the formation of the true and final philosophical system? Hume's work as an intellectual alarm-clock is a little too familiar to be recalled in its conventional terms. But post-Kantian empiricists are taboo. With the "German systems" ready and to hand they should have known better. There is a parallel here with the critical assessments in the history of thought made by communists. Pre-Marxian liberals are perfectly honourable and ac-

ceptable. Thomas More, Winstanley and Voltaire deserve praise for doing the best they could in the circumstances. But post-Marxian liberals, in their unregenerate refusal to see the light, are plain class enemies, the worst, because most insidious, of reactionary hyenas.

Most contemporary philosophers are, then, suspicious in principle of the history of their subject. When they do turn to it they have to rely on highly partisan sources of information and so are helplessly led into taking up the depreciatory attitude of their opponents to their immediate predecessors. In philosophy, as in literature, it is a good thing that from time to time there should be reassessments of the status of the leading figures. Something has been done in recent years for the Stoic logicians and a great deal for Leibniz. Russell and Popper, while not disputing his importance, have cast timely doubts on the moral perfection of Plato. But much remains to be done. There has been nothing like the contemporary reconstruction of the history of poetry. The great materialist tradition from Democritus and Lucretius to Hobbes has been universally denied the esteem it deserves. Both left and right, from Ayer to Collingwood, are at one in their Cartesian dismissal of this way of thinking. On the other hand the importance of Berkeley is generally inflated, perhaps because of the perfect lucidity and elegance of his style. Heroic efforts have not really succeeded in securing for Peirce the attention he is owed. But no oblivion is so profound as that which envelops the British philosophers of the nineteenth century.

There is, of course, the exceptional case that I have mentioned, that of Mill. But his status is equivocal. In the first place he is regarded in complete abstraction from his environment as a muddled continuation of Hume. The Hamiltonian "philosophy of intuition" which was the occasion of his chief philosophical work is completely unknown. Furthermore he is used with the utmost disrespect as a sort of punch-drunk sparring-partner. His work is treated as an assemblage of dreadful mistakes: wrong about mathematics, wrong about induction, wrong about the mind, and wrong, oh utterly wrong, about morals. Despite his handy formulation of phenomenalism he is not a great philosopher but simply a great reservoir of elementary errors and so a most opportune pedagogical instrument. Mill was a main target for the late Victorian idealists and came in for as large a share of Bradley's abusive polemics as anyone. As a defender and articulator of the methods of natural science, as a believer in their applicability to man and society, as a declared adherent of the empiricist tradition, as an opponent of moral and political authoritarianism, as one who based his ethics on human nature and defined the ends of conduct by reference to human desires, he was natu-

rally exposed to such an assault. What is surprising is that his stock has not gone up with the change of regime. If anything it has gone even further down.

The main explanation lies in the first half of the chapter on hedonism in Moore's *Principia Ethica,* particularly in eight or nine lethal pages in the middle of the passage in question. Here some rather calamitous attempts by Mill to demonstrate what he had declared not to admit of proof are memorably demolished. However fleeting his acquaintance with philosophy there can hardly be an undergraduate student of the subject who does not at least know his way round this cluster of arguments and as a result there are few philosophical doctrines so universally and unreflectively condemned as utilitarianism. But that doctrine does not sink or swim with the unfortunate "considerations capable of determining the intellect either to give or to withhold its assent" that Moore fastened on in Mill's treatise. Moore's attempt to demolish Sidgwick's view that nothing can have value out of relation to human consciousness or feeling is much less successful. It rests on a rather absurd *Gedankenexperiment* about whose outcome Moore is at once dogmatic and obtuse. Apart from that, a less rigidly disputatious approach to Mill's own arguments would have revealed more than is commonly found in them. Mill's equivocation about the word "desirable" was a careless way of making Sidgwick's point that value must be relative to human feelings. The fallacy of composition by which Mill passes from "each man desires his own happiness" to "every man desires every man's happiness" was his very rough and ready substitute for the widely accepted doctrine that moral convictions are essentially universal in character, that this is part of what is meant by calling a conviction "moral." Finally Mill's view that pleasure is the only object of desire is, in the sense in which he intends the term "pleasure," a definitional truism. Moore's rejection of ethical "naturalism" is the most significant residue of Kantian thinking in present-day analytic philosophy. The abyss which Kant interposed between duty and inclination has simply been reconstructed along linguistic lines. Nowadays it divides evaluative from descriptive expressions. It is a signal impurity in the revolutionary creed whose elimination is obstructed by hostile *idées reçues* about utilitarianism.

Mill's logic has not done much better than his ethics, though it has not had to undergo such a classical disintegration. Still Frege's handling of Mill is as ferocious as Moore's even if not quite as well known. The first of Frege's three principles of philosophical method was "always to separate sharply the psychological from the logical, the

subjective from the objective," a point which Bradley constantly insisted on with his distinction of two senses of "idea." The implicit Platonism of this admittedly fruitful canon has repelled twentieth-century empiricists less than the empiricist theory of logic against which it was mainly directed. Just lately there have been some signs of a desire to do more justice to Mill. Professor Ryle has said of him: "Mill's theory of meaning set the questions, and, in large measure, determined their answers for thinkers as different as Brentano, in Austria; Meinong and Husserl, who were pupils of Brentano; Bradley, Jevons, Venn, Frege, James, Peirce, Moore and Russell. This extraordinary achievement was due chiefly to the fact that Mill was original in producing a doctrine of meaning at all . . . Nearly all of the thinkers I have listed were in vehement opposition to certain parts of Mill's doctrine, and it was the other parts of it from which they often drew their most effective weapons."[1] On the ethical side Professor Urmson has exploded some of the more insistent misinterpretations. But Mill's rehabilitation has only begun. He remains the Dreyfus of British philosophy, the whole established order of things seems to have conspired inadvertently against him.

Mill is at least scorned; the other Victorian philosophers appear to be totally forgotten. I have explained this as a result of the idealists' corner in the history of philosophy, combined with their belief in the work of Kant and Hegel as its apogee. The question now arises: are any of them really worth resuscitating, and if so who? The first thing that needs to be set in order is the bare composition of this segment of philosophical history. I should imagine that most professional philosophers of the present time know no more of Hamilton than that he was mixed up with some dreary muddle about the quantification of the predicate, that unless they have looked into Dean Burgon's *Twelve Good Men* they know no more of Mansel than his name, that they think of Clifford and Pearson as simply progressive-minded popularisers of natural science, of G. H. Lewes as simply George Eliot's lover, and that they have never heard of Ferrier or John Grote at all. Under pressure they would describe the course of philosophy between Hume and Russell in roughly the following terms: first of all there is Mill carrying on in a more or less eighteenth-century fashion, beside him spring up a whole lot of amateur philosophers like Spencer of materialistic tendency and intoxicated by the doctrine of evolution, at which point the defenders of religion and public order pull themselves together and import a quantity of surplus metaphysical material from Germany whose rich obscurity

1 "The Theory of Meaning" in *British Philosophy in the Mid-Century*, ed. C. A. Mace (London, 1957), p. 241.

soon puts an end to the complacency of secular rationalism.

It is not difficult to get hold of a more complete and faithful account of the course of events. Consistent stories of the period are to be found in Sorley's contributions to the *Cambridge History of English Literature* (1916), in Dawes Hicks' long chapter on "die Englische Philosophie" in the fifth volume of Ueberweg (1906), in the first part of Metz's large book (1938), and in the last two chapters of Carré's *Phases of Thought in England* (1949). After Hume there were two possible lines of action. Either you could accept Hume and, shutting up shop as a philosopher, turn into a psychologist, the response of Hartley, Tucker and Priestley, or you could attempt an answer to Hume in roughly his own terms. The second course was followed by the Scottish philosophers. What is not sufficiently realised is that they have as good a right to regard themselves as the continuators of the empiricist tradition as has the school of associationists and utilitarians whose chief ornament is Mill. The two groups are the right and left wing factions into which the main empiricist body was divided by the scandalous character of Hume's ideas. Reid's method is very much that which was laid down by Locke, at least as a programme: the careful introspective examination of what goes on in one's head in various forms of thinking. (De Ruggiero describes the works of the Scottish philosophers, not unfairly, as "psychological museums.") Dugald Stewart's generally rather hollow and orotund pages come more to life when he is expounding his version of Hobbesian nominalism. Brown fully accepts Hume's analysis of the notion of cause and denies that there is any kind of real connection between cause and effect. But he gets round the lamentable results which Hume arrives at from this thoroughly extensional starting-point by claiming to intuit the necessary truth of the causal principle. The Lockean procedure of the Scottish philosophers, with its identification of philosophy with the introspective psychology of thinking, the examination of the "facts of consciousness," led in practice to pretty Lockean results. But they were not hampered by Locke's overt and practically ineffective repudiation of "innate principles." They believed, as Locke did, that there could be no quality without a substance and no event without a cause. Unlike Locke, they were prepared to admit the theoretical consequences of their convictions. Their "principles of common sense," or, as Stewart preferred to call them, "the fundamental laws of human belief," together with the large number of basic notions on whose indefinability Reid always insisted, make their doctrines interestingly similar to those of the Oxford realists of the first decades of the present century – Cook Wilson and Prichard. The kind of empirical in-

tuitionism that both groups exemplify is an important and continuing strand in British philosophy.

But the most influential echo of Scottish philosophy at the present day is the principle that Moore took over from Reid, "to what purpose is it for philosophy to decide against common sense in this or any other matter? The belief of a material world is older, and of more authority, than any principles of philosophy." The only essential change introduced by Hamilton and Mansel is a greater degree of agnosticism; their method and chief interests are the same as their predecessors' were. Hamilton's vaunted Kantianism is thoroughly superficial. All the Scottish philosophers were Kantian to the extent that they were anxious to preserve the fabric of human knowledge from Humean dissolution. But the means by which they tried to carry out this rescue work have nothing but their final outcome in common with Kant's. Where he derives the organising principles of thought from an examination of the necessary structure and workings of the mind they are content with the more humdrum and economical assertion of these principles as indubitable truths. The following remark on Kant's theory of space is characteristic of the ponderous bluff with which Hamilton hoped to pass himself off as a Kantian: "The analysis of Kant . . . has placed this truth (that the notion of space is not derived from the senses) beyond the possibility of doubt, to all those who understand the meaning and conditions of the problem." Mill's attack on Hamilton was not, then, a manoeuvre in the conflict of empiricism with speculative metaphysics, as Mill himself was inclined to suggest; it was part of an internal struggle within the empiricist camp.

The other important fact about the Scottish philosophers that is generally ignored is that they were the dominant philosophical school in Great Britain for just about a hundred years. Reid's most important book, the *Inquiry into the Human Mind,* came out in 1764, his two volumes of essays in the eighties. On the pamphleteering level Beattie's stupid but richly rewarded assault on Hume appeared in 1770. At the other end of the period Mill's *Examination of Hamilton* came out in 1865. In demolishing the chief figure of the prevailing school it succeeded in opening the way for something even less sympathetic to philosophers of Mill's persuasion, the Hegelianism that was heralded in the same year with Stirling's *Secret of Hegel.* In the United States the influence of the Scots was more prolonged, though the rise of Hegelianism could well be dated from 1867, the year in which Harris's *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* first appeared.

Left-wing empiricism in the nineteenth century mainly flour-

ished outside the universities. Its orthodox form, as worked out by Bentham and the Mills, was soon elbowed out of the way by a much less philosophically sophisticated evolutionist point of view. Mainly the work of complete philosophical amateurs like T. H. Huxley, evolutionism reached some sort of culmination in the grandiose encyclopedia of Herbert Spencer. It is significant that the metaphysical top-dressing with which Spencer decorated his system is in all essentials lifted from Hamilton. Later Millians, at any rate, such as Bain, Croom Robertson and Sully, were eclipsed by the bold but philosophically shallow eloquence of men like Huxley and Tyndall.

Professor Aiken of Harvard has recently prophesied that Spencer is due for a revival. "If his own age overrated him," he writes, "ours has underrated his merits."[2] I should be more inclined to back two philosophers whose work is in marked accord with a good deal of recent thought and who have been excessively ignored in recent times – W. K. Clifford and Karl Pearson. This neglect has been encouraged by the practice of most historians of nineteenth-century philosophy of lumping them together with the evolutionary amateurs as just one more phase in the general outburst of pro-scientific and anti-religious enthusiasm that followed the publication of the *Origin of Species*. One of the many merits of Professor Passmore's excellent *A Hundred Years of Philosophy* is that he detaches Clifford and Pearson from the company of the pamphleteers with whom they are usually associated and puts them in their proper place beside the great European philosophers of science, Mach, Hertz and Poincaré, whose influence on modern analytic philosophy is more generally recognised. Russell has recalled the excitement with which at the age of fifteen he read Clifford's *Common Sense of the Exact Sciences* and has said of his philosophy of mathematics: "in this respect, as in many others, Clifford was ahead of almost all the best thinking of his time." The importance of Mach is not disputed. He was the chief philosophical stimulus for Einstein's great enterprises. In providing the logical positivists with a theory of experience he was as indispensable a forerunner of that movement as were Frege and Russell with their doctrines about logic and mathematics. His role in this matter has been properly emphasised by von Mises. Russell's own theory of knowledge underwent an increasingly Machian development from *Our Knowledge of the External World*, where Mach is singled out for praise even if his views are not wholly accepted, to the *Analysis of Mind*, in which a

2 *The Age of Ideology* (New York, 1956), p. 170.

full-blooded neutral monism of Mach's variety is expounded. But, as Professor Passmore remarks, "to try to establish 'priorities' as between Clifford, Pearson and Mach would be pointless." Their ideas are more honoured than their names.

With the idealists we return to more familiar country, though even here it is remarkable how little really serious examination their doctrines have been given. McTaggart has been devotedly investigated by Broad, but he is untypical. Dr. Ewing's large treatise on idealism is to a quite unrepresentative extent preoccupied with the problem of perception. There is no satisfactory study of any part of Bradley's vast output. The arrival of idealism in Britain is also still something of a mystery, for all the historians' vague gestures in the direction of Coleridge's addiction to Schelling and Carlyle's passion for things German. British idealism is especially interesting as a social phenomenon, as a conscience-stricken reaction against the heartless and vulgar complacency about material progress to be found in thinkers like Spencer. The social doctrine that Spencer extracted from the theory of evolution was grasping and cruel and seemed to underwrite the coarsest excesses of "materialism" as a style of life. On the other hand thoughtful defenders of religion were on the look-out for some more reputable support for their faith than blind adherence to dogma or the tinkling superficialities of deistic argument. If Bradley's conservatism was of that repellent, sneering kind to which academics are sometimes unfortunately attracted, Green's defence of state intervention is now generally recognised as an important intellectual preparation for the British Labour Party. And the career of Archbishop Temple is as much a part of the history of idealism in its bearing on religion as the truck-loads of Gifford lectures quietly mouldering in university libraries.

In rather different ways, then, the Scottish philosophers and the English Machians would seem to deserve more attention than they usually get. By ignoring the former a hundred recent if not preeminently distinguished years of British philosophy are passed over. In the works of the latter are to be found themes of central interest to philosophers of the present time worked out with freshness, authority and extreme literary skill, for both Clifford and Pearson are in the highest class as expository writers. The early chapters of Professor Passmore's book go some way towards correcting the mistaken emphases of his predecessors and providing us at last with a really reliable survey of the immediate philosophical past.

New College, Oxford

C. E. Tanzy

BROWNING, EMERSON, AND BISHOP BLOUGRAM

TRADITIONALLY, interpreters of Browning's "Bishop Blougram's Apology" have maintained that the poem represents the best possible defence of an obviously unworthy individual.[1] To them, the Bishop has been both fool and knave. Some years ago, however, Mr. F. E. L. Priestley, challenging the validity of the orthodox interpretations, insisted that Blougram is no arch-hypocrite, that the crassness of his arguments reflects not his crassness but his auditor's, that, indeed, the "Apology" is an argument deliberately calculated to meet and de-

1 Typically orthodox commentary upon the poem is that of G. K. Chesterton, who wrote that Browning put some excellent poetic passages "into the mouth of a vulgar, fashionable priest, justifying his own cowardice over the comfortable wine and the cigars," *Robert Browning* (London, 1925), p. 201. Thomas R. Lounsbury could not "get rid of the feeling that in this marvellous piece of dialectics there is lurking a fallacy," *The Early Literary Career of Robert Browning* (New York, 1911), p. 176. W. C. DeVane summed up the orthodox view by terming the "Apology" "an attempt to make a case for a sophistical priest at his possible worst," *A Browning Handbook* (New York, 1935), p. 215. (In the revised edition DeVane accepts Priestley's interpretation.)

stroy the position of a specific objector, Gigadibs.[2] Divergent as these two interpretations of "Blougram" appear, they are reconcilable. And the key to that reconciliation lies in the hitherto unexplored relationship between Browning and Ralph Waldo Emerson.

Emerson's *Representative Men* was published in 1850. That it was available to Browning at the time he was composing the "Apology"[3] – the winter of 1850-51 – is made clear by a letter written by Elizabeth Browning on February 10, 1851: "Then I have had heaps of books lately. They come in shoals like the fisheries – Southey's life, Household Words, Emerson's book upon heroes [*Representative Men*]. . . . Emerson's thoughts are very beautiful and the sword of his fine, keen language flashes before your eyes: he is certainly the greatest of the Americans."[4] More important than this external evidence, a comparison of Browning's poem with the fourth of the Emerson lectures – "Montaigne; Or, The Skeptic" – indicates that Emerson's work was much in Browning's mind as he wrote the "Apology." I do not, of course, wish to assert that Browning merely copied from Emerson. But I do suggest that if we use the Emerson essay as a background against which to see Browning's poem, we will be able to see that poem in a new and truer perspective.

Both Browning's poem and Emerson's essay consider the problem of skepticism. Both point out two opposing and extreme tendencies in man – the one towards pure materialism, the other towards pure idealism – and both place the skeptic between these extremes. "One class," Emerson wrote, "has the perception of difference"; these are the materialists. Another, "the perception of identity"; these, the idealists. "The abstractionist and the materialist . . . mutually exasperating each other, and the scoffer expressing the worst of materialism, there arises a third party to occupy the middle ground between these two, the skeptic, namely" (pp. 150, 154-155).[5] Gigadibs, a vacillator, resembles a composite of Emerson's three types. He is at one moment a materialist, at another an idealist, and at a third a skeptic. Like Montaigne, Brown-

2 See F. E. L. Priestley, "Blougram's Apologetics," *UTQ*, XV (1946), 139-147. Mr. Priestley lists the following writers as recognizing in various degrees what he takes to be Browning's real intention: E. M. Naish, *Browning and Dogma* (London, 1908), pp. 63-91; J. A. Hutton, *Guidance from Robert Browning in Matters of Faith* (Edinburgh and London, 1903), pp. 24-42; and C. R. Tracy, "Bishop Blougram," *MLR*, XXXIV (1939), 422-425. Mr. Priestley further points out that Browning is said to have acknowledged a connection between Blougram and Cardinal Wiseman but to have denied that there was anything hostile in the portrait.

3 See DeVane, *Handbook*, 2nd ed. (New York, 1955), p. 241.

4 See Theresa Coolidge, "A Letter by Elizabeth Barrett Browning," *More Books*, XXI (1946), p. 179.

5 Emerson references are to *The Complete Works*, Centenary Edition (Boston and New York, 1903), Vol. IV.

ing's little journalist has his "emblematic pair of scales." In theory, at least, he weighs one mode of life against another and chooses the one he thinks best. But Gigadibs does not always keep the balance true. At times, as a materialist, he admires the things of this world for their sake alone; at other times, he has visions of grandeur and acts as if the visions could be realities.

It is Gigadibs the materialist who accepts the Bishop's invitation to dinner. The journalist stays in order to hear the kind of "truth that peeps / Over the glasses' edge when dinner's done, / And body gets its sop and holds its noise" (17-19).[6] Gigadibs has no doubt that the bishop will let go his religious pretences and, "what with the wine," admit "the thing's his trade" (41). If Emerson's materialist were visiting Blougram, he would have expected the same kind of truth. "After dinner," Emerson's man of action observes, "a man believes less, denies more . . . After dinner, arithmetic is the only science," and "a man will be eloquent, if you give him good wine" (pp. 152-153).

But if Gigadibs exhibits an attitude which Emerson associates with materialists, he displays another facet which suggests the Emersonian abstractionist. Gigadibs has an "abstract intellectual plan of life," an ideal, "grand simple life" (81-92). Knowing as he does what would make life perfect, he will accept nothing less than perfection. If the captain of the ship which bears man's life confines a man's accoutrements to essentials, Gigadibs "in pique" goes on board empty handed. Thus he proves his "artist-nature" (142-143). Emerson's men of genius behave differently: "Having at some time seen that the happy soul will carry all the arts in power, they say, Why cumber ourselves with superfluous realizations? and like dreaming beggars they assume to speak and act as if these values were already substantiated" (p. 151). Gigadibs the idealist won't accept any world that does not come up to his vision; Emerson's men, just as foolishly, act as if their vision were fulfilled.

Blougram, immediately discerning that Gigadibs is an uneasy mixture of belief and disbelief, materialism and idealism, finds the shallow journalist an easy target, and, with an obvious sense of superiority, turns against his guest first a deep skepticism assumed for the occasion, and then a wisdom in which all skepticism is dissolved.

Against Gigadibs' abstract impossible ideal, Blougram, now the practical realist, presents "A simile!"

> We mortals cross the ocean of this world

[6] Browning references are to *The Works of Robert Browning*, ed. Sir F. G. Kenyon (London, 1912), Vol. IV.

> Each in his average cabin of a life;
> The best's not big, the worst yields elbow-room.
> Now for our six month's voyage – how prepare? (99-103)

Blougram decides that one must be aware that the cabin is small, and must bring on board only that which fits the size of the room and makes the voyage go well. Emerson's skeptic uses a different metaphor involving a ship to describe the philosophy by which he guides his life: "We want a ship in these billows we inhabit. An angular, dogmatic house would be rent to chips and splinters in this storm of many elements. No, it must be tight, and fit to the form of man, to live at all; as a shell must dictate the architecture of a house founded on the sea. . . . Adaptiveness is the peculiarity of human nature. We are golden averages, volitant stabilities, compensated or periodic errors, houses founded on the sea" (pp. 160-161). Both Emerson's skeptic and Bishop Blougram subscribe to a philosophy which recognizes man's limitations and enables him to live in a world which is simply "Rome or London, not Fool's-paradise" (96).

Blougram proceeds with his attack. He suggests that Gigadibs will not be a Bishop because as a skeptic he cannot express complete belief in divine revelation. "No dogmas nail your faith," Blougram says, "and what remains / But say so, like the honest man you are?" (154-155). Emerson's skeptic – a philosopher, however, and not a religionist – also will not "be betrayed to a book and wrapped in a gown" (p. 155). He says "Why think to shut up all things in your narrow coop . . . ?" (p. 157). "If there is a wish for immortality, and no evidence, why not say just that?" (p. 156). This is a brand of skepticism which is very difficult to circumvent. Having posed the problem, the Bishop meets it head on. He says he knows "where difficulties lie" which he "could not, cannot solve, nor ever shall, / So give up hope accordingly to solve" (165-167). Here Blougram is deliberately talking like an out-and-out skeptic, one who, in the company of Emerson's type, argues: "Of what use to take the chair and glibly rattle off theories of society, religion and nature, when I know that practical objections lie in the way, insurmountable by me and by my mates" (pp. 156-157). Emerson's skeptic stands "here to try the case," to "try to keep the balance true" (p. 156). Blougram goes even further; with studied recklessness he throws off all his dogmas and lets the balance dip to the unbelieving side.

But can one consistently maintain a strict unbelief? Blougram thinks not. "Belief," he says, "As unbelief before shakes us by fits" (177-178). There are fluctuating moods, and pure unbelief is as impossible as an unbelieving Pope. Emerson's skeptic concurs: "the right ground of

the skeptic," he says, is that "of consideration, of self-containing; not at all of unbelief; not at all of universal denying, nor of universal doubting, – doubting even that he doubts" (p. 159).

This attitude is acceptable to the skeptic Gigadibs. But, he argues, granted that there is belief and unbelief, "and both things even," can I not gain as much by emphasizing unbelief as by leaning to the other side? Blougram sets out to prove that he cannot, that in the terms of the unbeliever's own philosophy, a man's wisest role is that of the believer. In the first place, Blougram points out that the logical end of unbelief is inactivity:

> To be consistent you should keep your bed,
> Abstain from healthy acts that prove you man,
> For fear you drowse perhaps at unawares! (257-259)

And Emerson would agree: "The inconvenience of this way of thinking is that it runs into indifferentism and then into disgust. Life is eating us up," or as Emerson's scoffer would say: " 'tis hardly worth while to be here at all" (pp. 153-154).

In the second place, Blougram argues that it is the world's "Good things" he seeks, "power, peace, pleasantness and length of days" (582), the world's "estimation, which is half the fight" (266). A thoroughgoing unbeliever cannot attain such goals:

> What can I gain on the denying side?
> Ice makes no conflagration. State the facts,
> Read the text right, emancipate the world –
> The emancipated world enjoys itself
> With scarce a thank-you. (580-584)

According to Emerson's view, Blougram is right on both counts. The wise skeptic, Emerson says, is one who "wishes to have a near view of the best game and the chief players; what is best in the planet; art and nature, places and events; but mainly men" (p. 161). Nor can the unbeliever achieve these ends: "We are natural believers. . . . We love whatever affirms, connects, preserves; and dislike what scatters or pulls down." If the world has to choose between the negative man and the positive, it will follow the one who affirms, and will reject the man who "comes only with axe and crowbar" (pp. 170-171).

Obviously, one must espouse a positive philosophy; however, that is not enough. If one wants the estimation of his fellows, he must also fix upon a firm way of life, else the world finds him "baffled at the game." The Bishop's Catholicism serves him here; his adherence to "Peter's creed" exalts him over his fellows and makes his life "an ease and joy and pride" (318). Emerson says: "The terms of admission to

this spectacle are, that he have a certain solid and intelligible way of living of his own . . . proof that he has played with skill and success" (p. 161). In this sense, Blougram certainly has.

Nevertheless Blougram's way of life still does not satisfy the journalist's ideal; Gigadibs will not be Bishop. Blougram shifts his attack. He asks Gigadibs to name his "pattern man." Since Gigadibs is hesitant, Blougram comes to his aid: "Is it Napoleon you would have us grow?" (436). One of Gigadibs' conflicting characteristics, as we have seen, is his tendency towards materialism. Since Blougram is aware of this, it is understandable that one of the pattern men he should suggest would be a materialist. Now Emerson also considers the question of the ideal man of action, whose "tendency is material" (p. 224), and Emerson too selects "Napoleon; Or, The Man of The World." "Napoleon is thoroughly modern . . . The man in the street finds in him the qualities and powers of other men in the street. He finds him, like himself, by birth a citizen, who, by very intelligible merits, arrived at such a commanding position that he could indulge all those tastes which the common man possesses but is obliged to conceal and deny: good society, good books, fast travelling, dress, dinners, servants without number, personal weight . . . precisely what is agreeable to the heart of every man in the nineteenth century, this powerful man possessed" (pp. 225-226). Gigadibs of course is just such a man of the nineteenth century; his tastes are precisely those which Emerson attributes to Napoleon. But after considering Napoleon's attractive qualities, both Blougram and Emerson reject his way of life because it lacked all moral guidance. The means were ugly and the consequences repulsive. Blougram finds that the material gains of a life lived according to Napoleon's terms, "Will not drive off ugly thoughts and let me dine, / Sleep, read and chat in quiet as I like!" (483-484). Emerson finds: "Our riches will leave us sick; there will be bitterness in our laughter, and our wine will burn our mouth" (p. 258). While Napoleon may be the ideal of "half-men," he cannot finally be a satisfactory ideal.

Blougram offers Gigadibs another representative man; perhaps, since he fancies that he has an artistic temperament, he would like to be Shakespeare. Emerson too, in his *Representative Men*, has an ideal artist: "Shakspeare; Or, The Poet." And again Blougram and Emerson agree that their nominee isn't the perfect man. Blougram notices a cleavage between Shakespeare's life and his work, and Blougram uses this split to urge his own material superiority over the poet:

> I'll ask you, I or he,
> Which in our two lives realizes most? . . .

> Let him say, "In the face of my soul's works
> "Your world is worthless and I touch it not
> "Lest I should wrong them" – I'll withdraw my plea.
> But does he say so? look upon his life!
> Himself, who only can, gives judgment there.
> He leaves his towers and gorgeous palaces
> To build the trimmest house in Stratford town . . . (504-514)

While Emerson does not, like Blougram, concern himself with Shakespeare's material ambitions, he does notice a cleavage between Shakespeare's life and his work. After a lengthy appreciation of the poet's imaginative accomplishments, Emerson seeks to lift the scale and "strike the balance":

> As long as the question is of talent and mental power, the world of men has not his equal to show. But when the question is, to life and its materials and its auxiliaries, how does he profit me? What does it signify? It is but a Twelfth Night, or Midsummer-Night's Dream, or Winter Evening's Tale: what signifies another picture more or less? The Egyptian verdict of the Shakespeare Societies comes to mind; that he was a jovial actor and manager. I can not marry this fact to his verse. Other admirable men have led lives in some sort of keeping with their thought; but this man, in wide contrast. . . . The world still wants its poet-priest, a reconciler, who shall not trifle, with Shakespeare the player . . . but who shall see, speak, and act, with equal inspiration. (pp. 218-219)

Blougram argued that "the earth's best can be but the earth's best" (527). Having found Shakespeare to be imperfect, he has made clear that no matter what path Gigadibs might choose to follow, he would find none more consonant with the philosophy of unbelief than the one chosen by the Bishop himself.

The "Blougram" and the "Montaigne" again coincide when, forced to admit that asserted belief has value even to the unbeliever, Gigadibs attempts to bring discredit on such belief as is mixed with doubt. Give me, he cries, "Whole faith, or none!" The Bishop finds himself "back on Christian ground." "Once own the use of faith," he says, "I'll find you faith" (600). Not the kind Gigadibs would have, however, for pure faith would be contingent upon an unnatural direct contact with the Infinite:

> Naked belief in God the Omnipotent,
> Omniscient, Omnipresent, sears too much
> The sense of conscious creatures to be borne. . . .
> Under a vertical sun, the exposed brain
> And lidless eye and disemprisoned heart
> Less certainly would wither up at once
> Than mind, confronted with the truth of him. (647-661)

This, in Emerson's opinion, had been the effect of such communion

upon the mystic Swedenborg, although, of course, Emerson does not claim that Swedenborg's mind withered up "at once": "If the glory was too bright for his eyes to bear, if he staggered under the trance of delight, the more excellent is the spectacle he saw, the realities of being which beam and blaze through him . . ." (p. 145). Whole faith of the type Gigadibs insists on is beyond the grasp of ordinary men; it may be possessed by a Lazarus or a Swedenborg, but in Emerson's terms, it is a beatitude which "comes in terror, and with shocks to the mind of the receiver. 'It o'erinforms the tenement of clay,' and drives the man mad" (p. 97).

To Blougram, true faith consists of trusting one's affirmative instincts in spite of all the doubts that may appear:

> Trust you an instinct silenced long ago
> That will break silence and enjoin you love
> What mortified philosophy is hoarse,
> And all in vain, with bidding you despise? (630-633)

Emerson's definition is a parallel one. "Belief," he says, "consists in accepting the affirmations of the soul; unbelief, in denying them" (p. 180). Certainly there are doubts, but to Blougram and Emerson these have a positive utility. Blougram says:

> With me, faith means perpetual unbelief
> Kept quiet like the snake 'neath Michael's foot
> Who stands calm just because he feels it writhe.
> Or, if that's too ambitious, – here's my box –
> I need the excitation of a pinch
> Threatening the torpor of the inside-nose
> Nigh on the imminent sneeze that never comes.
> "Leave it in peace" advise the simple folk:
> Make it aware of peace by itching-fits,
> Say I – let doubt occasion still more faith! (666-675)

And Emerson questions: "Is life to be led in a brave or in a cowardly manner? and is not the satisfaction of the doubts essential to all manliness? . . . Can you not believe that a man of earnest and burly habit may find small good in tea, essays and catechism, and want a rougher instruction, want . . . war, hunger, plenty, love, hatred, doubt and terror to make things plain to him . . . ?" (p. 180).

Nevertheless, Gigadibs insists, some people do exercise a faith so pure that doubts caused by "contradiction in the facts" never occur. "Ay," Blougram responds, "but who and where?" In these days, even the most enraptured saint isn't fooled into believing his vision is reality:

> King Bomba's lazzaroni foster yet
> The sacred flame, so Antonelli writes;

> But even of these, what ragamuffin-saint
> Believes God watches him continually,
> As he believes in fire that it will burn,
> Or rain that it will drench him? Break fire's law,
> Sin against rain, although the penalty
> Be just a singe or soaking? "No," he smiles;
> "Those laws are laws that can enforce themselves."
> (713-723)

Emerson complains against what he calls "the cloy or satiety of the saints. In the mount of vision, ere they have yet risen from their knees, they say, 'We discover that this our homage and beatitude is partial and deformed: we must fly for relief to the suspected and reviled Intellect, to the Understanding, the Mephistopheles, to the gymnastics of talent' " (p. 174). If this is true of the saints, how much more wholesome is Blougram's declaration: "The sum of all is – yes, my doubt is great, / My faith's still greater, then my faith's enough" (723-724).

Gigadibs, however, is not yet defeated. He still has objections to raise, objections which Blougram quickly rejects. When, for example, Gigadibs complains that Blougram has too great a respect for "the creature comforts," the Bishop replies that though "Pure spiritual enjoyment" may be the yield of the next life, "Why lose this life i' the meantime?" (777-778). Or, as Emerson's skeptic puts it: "Why be an angel before your time?" (p. 156). Even so Gigadibs is not satisfied, and Blougram grants that thus far Gigadibs can logically maintain a position opposite to his. But there is one argument left. If you will, Blougram says, analyze everything down to the bone:

> Does law so analyzed coerce you much?
> Oh, men spin clouds of fuzz when matters end,
> But you who reach where the first thread begins,
> You'll soon cut that! – which means you can, but won't,
> Through certain instincts, blind, unreasoned out,
> You dare not set aside, you can't tell why,
> But there they are, and so you let them rule. (834-840)

Skepticism, according to Blougram, is unable to get around the inner guide, the instinct that is always with man, always guiding his actions. As Emerson puts it: "The final solution in which skepticism is lost, is in the moral sentiment, which never forfeits its supremacy. All moods may be safely tried, and their weight allowed to all objections: the moral sentiment as easily outweighs them all, as any one. This is the drop which balances the sea" (p. 183).

But if mention of the moral sentiment is the thrust that kills the victim, Blougram is not above giving a final twist of the blade to make

certain that the corpse stays dead. Gigadibs is finally subdued by Blougram's emphasis upon what Emerson terms "the tragedy of all souls." Blougram makes dramatically clear how far Gigadibs will fall short of of his ambition:

> In truth's name, don't you want my bishopric,
> My daily bread, my influence and my state? . . .
> Suppose we die to-night: well, here am I
> Such were my gains, life bore this fruit to me . . .
> But you – the highest honour in your life,
> The thing you'll crown yourself with, all your days,
> Is – dining here and drinking this last glass . . . (903-918)

This is what exasperates Gigadibs. Here is his ambition, here is his reality. Through the rest of the conversation, Blougram, returning to the position with which he began, presents indisputable evidence that life cannot possibly give what it seems to offer – that a man must in the end be satisfied with the little furniture he can put into his cabin, even though he knows that under more favorable circumstances his cabin might have been a stateroom. Blougram has reconciled himself to the predicament and has gained somewhat. Like Emerson's believer, "He can behold with serenity the yawning gulf between the ambition of man and his power of performance, between the demand and supply of power, which makes the tragedy of all souls" (p. 183). Gigadibs, a man without faith, cannot have such serenity. Consequently Blougram's contrast between the little journalist's hopes and his attainments touches home; Gigadibs leaves in a state of "vehemence."

But is it certain that Blougram is a believer? After all, he does dare Gigadibs to publish his words:

> You're shrewd and know that should you publish one
> The world would brand the lie – my enemies first,
> Who'd sneer – 'the bishop's an arch-hypocrite
> And knave perhaps, but not so frank a fool.'
> Whereas I should not dare for both my ears
> Breathe one such syllable, smile one such smile,
> Before the chaplain who reflects myself . . . (926-931)

Certainly this statement suggests that Blougram is not a sincere believer and that critics have had good cause for oppugning his character. Mr. Priestley argues, however, that to accept such a statement at its face value is to miss the essence of Blougram's technique, which is to allow the tone of Gigadibs' mind to set the tone of many of Blougram's own utterances, and to allow the premises of Gigadibs' arguments to establish the grounds upon which he will refute them:

> Our dogmas then
> With both of us, though in unlike degree,
> Missing full credence – overboard with them!
> I mean to meet you on your own premise . . . (168-171)

Hence through most of the poem, Blougram *appears* to be a skeptic. But he has assumed this attitude only to demonstrate to Gigadibs a truth more fundamental than occurs in the journalist's surface thinking. For before agreeing to meet Gigadibs on his own ground, Blougram has warned: "You're wrong – I mean to prove it in due time" (164). Thus, Mr. Priestley finds, Blougram is a truly sincere man deliberately defending his mode of life within the framework of skepticism. Now this is precisely what Emerson says a really believing man may do. "Great believers," he claims, "are always reckoned infidels . . . fantastic, atheistic . . . The spiritualist finds himself driven to express his faith by a series of skepticisms" (p. 181). A truly superior mind "will know how to avail himself of the checks and balances" of skepticism "as a natural weapon against the exaggeration and formalism of bigots and blockheads" (p. 171). It was just such a blockhead that Blougram felt he had put down:

> "On the whole," he thought, "I justify myself
> "On every point where cavillers like this
> "Oppugn my life: he tries one kind of fence,
> "I close, he's worsted, that's enough for him." (997-1000)

But the contest does not end without Blougram's recognizing the tentativeness of his own position. He concludes:

> "He's on the ground: if ground should break away
> "I take my stand on, there's a firmer yet
> "Beneath it, both of us may sink and reach.
> "His ground was over mine and broke the first:
> "So, let him sit with me this many a year!" (1001-05)

And the triumphant final lines of Emerson's essay seem to anticipate Blougram's image.

> Let a man learn to look for the permanent in the mutable and fleeting . . . let him learn that he is here, not to work but to be worked upon; and that, though abyss open under abyss, and opinion displace opinion, all are at last contained in the Eternal Cause: –
>
> "If my bark sink, 'tis to another sea." (p. 186)

Our discovery of the "Montaigne" as a background against which the "Apology" may be seen therefore supports Mr. Priestley's interpretation of Blougram's real character. But we must still consider the curious turn the "Apology" takes when Browning, speaking in his own

person, looks back upon the interview. He observes of Gigadibs:

> He did not sit five minutes. Just a week
> Sufficed his sudden healthy vehemence.
> Something had struck him in the "outward-bound"
> Another way than Blougram's purpose was:
> And having bought, not cabin-furniture
> But settler's-implements (enough for three)
> And started for Australia – there, I hope,
> By this time he has tested his first plough,
> And studied his last chapter of St. John. (1006-14)

Clearly something unexpected has happened. Not only has Blougram successfully defended himself but the conversation has had good results. Somehow – Emerson might suggest by a "reflex" or "parasite faith" (p. 180) – Gigadibs has been brought to throw off his grandiose ambitions and to work in the world that is. This "healthy" result is a "give-away." It is the key to a more adequate understanding of "Bishop Blougram." To demonstrate this point, it is necessary to remember that at first glance the Bishop *does* appear to be the frankest of fools and a knave to boot. But how, then, is it possible to explain the really good influence the "evil" Bishop has upon his visitor? The answer lies partially in Browning's own optimism and partially in that of Emerson. At the very end of his "Montaigne," Emerson observes: "Things seem to say one thing, and say the reverse. The appearance is immoral; the result is moral. Things seem to tend downward, to justify despondency, to promote rogues, to defeat the just; and by knaves as by martyrs the just cause is carried forward. . . . Through the years and the centuries, through evil agents, through toys and atoms, a great and beneficent tendency irresistibly streams" (pp. 185-186). If this general philosophy were to be humanized and dramatized, one could not wish for a better representation than that provided by the superficially unscrupulous Bishop and the mysteriously changed Gigadibs. For on the "surface" level Blougram is evil; on the "real" level he is good. The change in Gigadibs demonstrates how invisible good lying beneath visible evil functions through and in spite of that evil. Bishop Blougram in his deliberate surface hypocrisy and in his underlying faith provides, in his encounter with Gigadibs, a poetic rendering of a transcendental affirmation.

The Ohio State University

NOTES

The Cambridge University 19th-Century Group

IT SEEMS APPROPRIATE to record, in a periodical devoted to the study of nineteenth-century life and thought in all their aspects, the foundation at Cambridge, England, of a group with the same bold broad intention. The 19th-Century Group meets two or three times a term and aims to bring together established scholars and research students from all faculties for the exchange of views and information on selected nineteenth-century themes. Most of the regulars are necessarily historians, but the faculties of English, Law, Economics, Theology, Medicine and Fine Arts are also represented, and the meetings are open to any visitors from other universities and countries who may please to come along.

The foundation of the group was mainly the work of Dr. Kitson Clark. With the assistance of a small committee of friends (representing, incidentally, economic, political, and ecclesiastical history), he called a meeting in late October of 1956 to measure support, discuss principles, and outline a programme. The support was extremely encouraging, and it was agreed that, in general, meetings would be most profitable and lively if begun, not by full-dress learned papers, but by informal discourses of not more than thirty minutes duration, to introduce a subject of common interest and to provoke a discussion to which all the members of the group might conceivably be able to make some contribution.

The course of the group so far has justified this plan, although the half-hour limit has not in practice been easy to observe, and full-dress papers have been accepted from those who prefer to give them. A list of the meetings to date may interest readers: it will be observed that a good many aspects of the nineteenth-century have already been covered. Discussions

have been initiated by Dr. O. O. G. M. MacDonagh, on administrative reform and the alleged extent of Benthamic influence upon it; Mr. C. H. Wilson, on population problems; Dr. Kitson Clark, on the problem of dividing the century into periods; the Master of Emmanuel, Mr. E. Welbourne, on the mythology of free trade; Mr. Graham Hough, on Coleridge's influence on the early Victorians; and Dr. John Kent, on Methodism and politics. In the future forseeable at the time of writing, meetings will be set going by Dr. Arthur Rook, on the organisation of the medical profession; Dr. John Roach, on the relation of the universities to the intelligentsia; Dr. G. F. A. Best, on popular protestantism; and Professor David Spring, a most welcome visitor from Johns Hopkins, on the aristocracy. Meetings are also projected on evolution and popular culture.

Of the benefits which we hope may accrue to nineteenth-century studies from the activities of this group, two in particular have made themselves apparent so far. First, the exponents of the different disciplines have been surprised to realise in what very different ways they approach problems of common concern, and even how dissimilar their conceptions of these problems can be. At meetings where this dissimilarity has been made apparent, people have taken the opportunity to gauge its extent, and attempted to break it down in discussion. Second, information of common interest has been exchanged by scholars who might otherwise never have found any means of inter-communication. This has proved especially valuable in cases where *practical* men have joined in the discussions, as they did for instance in that on population, when the medical men present were able to disprove or discount out of hand, from their inside knowledge of the science, theories and beliefs about medicine which seemed perfectly credible to the historians. A similar advantage is anticipated when the discussion on evolution is opened by a biologist.

The Cambridge 19th-Century Group is a very informal organisation, which meets usually in Dr. Kitson Clark's large rooms in Trinity, after dinner on a Friday evening. Informality has many advantages but to visitors to Cambridge these may not be very clear. They are therefore invited to seek information as to the times and dates of meetings from the very informal pseudo-secretary—

G. F. A. BEST

Trinity Hall, Cambridge

When Did "Victorianism" End?

THE DEATH OF THE AGED QUEEN but a few short weeks after the closing year of the nineteenth century has no doubt appeared to most of us to have the sort of chronological appropriateness which history does occasionally provide. It had only just failed to present an equally striking coincidence three hundred years earlier when the greatest of English queens lingered on for a couple of years, thus foregoing the opportunity to bring the Elizabethan age to a

similarly appropriate conclusion. But if in the case of Victoria we look into the matter more closely, it can be argued (and it is my purpose here to suggest) that the chronological coincidence was more apparent than real. If the Queen had died in the year of her first Jubilee the "Victorian Age" would, I believe, have been far more significantly concluded. For the last dozen years of the century belonged, or so it has always seemed to me, to another epoch; they are not an epilogue to Victorianism but rather a prologue to Edwardianism. The *fin de siècle* does not tranquilly wind up the century; it inaugurates a new one. Confusedly and clamantly no doubt; these years have been well described as the Noisy Nineties. While all divisions of historical time are inevitably to a large extent arbitrary in character, there is more to suggest the unity of a period in the years from 1887 to 1914 than is apparent in most such theoretical fragmentations. Nearly all that is most obviously Victorian lies behind, and since 1914 the life of England, and even Europe, and to some extent too of the world beyond, has belonged to another age, a period in which we are still living. For 1914 was the Grand Canyon of the modern world.

This period of less than thirty years before the first World War has, in Britain at any rate, its own peculiar character, to express which no designation has been, or can easily be, found. It was "Edwardian" before Edward; liberal, yet in a manner quite unlike the Gladstonian liberalism which still lingered on in it; socialist even, in a peculiarly English way, yet as England, unlike the Continent, had never previously been; a phase inaugurated by the publication of *Fabian Essays* in 1889. Victoria lived on, but Victorianism was dead.

So, of course, were nearly all the most characteristic Victorian figures; the few who survived did not do so for long. Newman, born in the first year of the century, died in 1890; Tennyson in 1892; Gladstone in 1898; only Ruskin remained till 1900 and he had been *hors de combat* for the last dozen years of his life. The writers of the nineties, with all their vivid variety of outlook, were in few cases characteristically Victorian either in their manner or in their interests. Meredith and Hardy were, of course, still writing in the nineties, but they were hardly of the nineties. Meredith was over sixty by this time and only three of his novels appeared after 1887. Hardy was a dozen years younger and *Tess* was published after this date; he is perhaps the closest link in literature between the Victorian age in the sense in which I have been using the term and that which followed it. If Kipling's Indian tales did perhaps have something Victorian about them, their setting would account for that; his verse did not. It was "Romance," not George Stephenson, which "brought up the 9.15." The very "imperialism" with which his name will ever be associated was not really a Victorian phenomenon – only Disraeli of the mid-century statesmen really cared about it; and in any case Kipling was as much concerned to ridicule its *hubris* as to laud its achievements. No one will readily call Oscar Wilde a Victorian; that age could never have case satiric doubt on, or even made fun of, "the importance of being earnest." Shaw was already entering his thirties at the end of the eighties and was soon to produce those "Unpleasant" plays which no Victorian audience would have tolerated for a moment. At the same time a young man training

as a chemist was preparing his "Anticipations" of a future of the like of which few Victorians had ever dreamt. H. G. Wells introduced England to that very twentieth-century phenomenon, "science fiction," with his *War of the Worlds*, a genre which perhaps derived in a measure from Jules Verne but owed nothing to any Victorian exemplar.

The Queen's reign had been the age of steam; the nineties began to universalize electricity and introduced the petrol engine. Our anonymous period opening with the "pennyfarthing" bicycle and ended with the aeroplane. The typewriter, the telephone, the gramophone, the "moving pictures," these were among the forces which were to revolutionize British industrial and social life; they were not only adumbrated but in increasingly widespread operation in the decade before Victoria died. More significant still perhaps is the emergence of a popular press. The Education Act of 1870 had by this time produced generations sufficiently literate to welcome *Tit-Bits* and the *Daily Mail*, and to make fortunes for their proprietors which were to raise them to a new power in the community such as no Walter or Delane had ever known.

Behind all this development was the economic recovery of the country after more than a decade of almost chronic depression – a period which added a new word, "unemployment," to the dictionary. In the early months of 1887 a long procession of the workers and their sympathizers had wound its way through the streets of London to the funeral of a young man ridden down by the police in a proletarian demonstration. But a later procession in that year, which took the Queen to St. Paul's Cathedral to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the opening of her reign, included features which pointed to more prosperous conditions – the overseas contingents and the carriages conveying the statesmen attending the first Colonial Conference. A new era of expanding markets and new sources of raw materials was beginning; in particular the "opening up" of Africa was, seventy years after Canning's dictum, calling into being another "new world" to relieve the frustrations of the old. The birth of a militant movement amongst the so far unorganized unskilled workers testified to the "better times" for which the changing conditions were beginning to provide a basis. The famous Dock Strike of 1889 was in fact a "prosperity strike"; it came when it did because at length there was a chance of success for it. British industrialism was by no means out of the wood; the trade cycle continued to revolve, and there was plenty of sweating and poverty for reformers to expose right down to the years of the 1914 war. We are far from the Welfare State, though the reforms of the pre-war Liberal government could be interpreted as pointing forward to it. (They were, of course, also interpreted by Hilaire Belloc and the Distributists as foreshadowing a "servile state" and the statutory regimentation of the masses.) But the desperate misery of the "submerged tenth" which was a persistent feature of the ups and downs of Victorian "prosperity" was on the way out, and the permanence of a caste system of society was, by the end of the eighties, no longer generally taken for granted.

Such, in outline, is the case for the thesis I have been advancing that Victorianism came to an end a dozen years before Victoria herself did so. It must be understood that in so arguing I am implying no suggestion that the

period which followed 1887 was necessarily "better" or "worse" than the Victorian age. Progress, however we may interpret so ambiguous a term, has its reverses as well as its victories, and in any case historical judgments are seldom or never so objective as those who pronounce them believe them to be. My point is not that what followed the first fifty years of the Queen's reign was an improvement on what had gone before, but that it was something different. Yet while advancing this view I am aware that in arriving at it I may be affected by a fact apt to be overlooked by those who write about the recent past – that there is a point at which a commentator in a sense says goodbye to "history" and enters upon "the present day." There are not very many Englishmen now alive who have a vivid recollection of what life was actually like before 1887, while for what developed after that date there are tens of thousands who do not have to rely entirely on either the written record or the historian's judgment for recollections and interpretations. A man born at the time of the first Jubilee (I myself was born a year later) will now have reached the traditionally allotted span. He will be specially prone perhaps to believe that he entered upon life at a turning point in the history of his country. Despite the delusions which may wait upon so egocentric an outlook, I believe that in this instance such a person, if an Englishman, will be ultimately revealed to have been right.

MAURICE B. RECKITT

Guildford, Surrey

The Crimean War in Selected Documents and Secondary Works since 1940

WHATEVER OTHER APTITUDES Victorians may have possessed, military proficiency was clearly lacking. The Crimean War had been filled with hosts of those lessons which disasters seem to teach; and yet, nearly half a century later, the Boer War demonstrated that despite some progress and impressive-sounding reforms, the British were still poorly equipped in things military. J. W. Fortescue's *A History of the British Army* (13 vols., London, 1889-1930) is generally reliable for this period; but although Fortescue covered a vast area well, he left a great deal to be done. More research was especially needed on Britain's expeditionary force in the Crimean War.

While Lord Raglan was leading the British contingent in the Crimea, he had as his guest Arthur William Kinglake, distinguished at the time as the author of *Eothen*. Kinglake became Raglan's enthusiastic chronicler in much the manner that centuries earlier Jean, Sire de Joinville, had recorded the story of Louis IX on the crusade of 1248-54. Upon publication, Kinglake's "history" became at once the standard work on the war and the point of departure for all later scholars, Fortescue included.[1] Since Kinglake's time,

[1] A. W. Kinglake, *The Invasion of the Crimea, Its Origin and an Account of its Progress Down to the Death of Lord Raglan* (6 vols., London, 1863-80).

substantial amounts of documents, monographs, and synthetic studies have supplemented and corrected his narrative; new materials are still daily appearing, and the last decade and a half has witnessed a number of interesting and important contributions.

The public mind has remembered the Crimean War primarily as the common setting for the work of Florence Nightingale and the Charge of the Light Brigade during the battle of Balaclava on 25 October 1854. These have also attracted the attention of a very gifted writer, Mrs. Cecil Woodham-Smith. Her *Florence Nightingale* (London, 1950) was an interesting, well-written biography and probably influenced the general reception given to her later book, *The Reason Why* (London, 1953), which purports to tell the story of the charge and especially "the reason why." This account merits particular attention, since the non-historian is just as likely to get his impressions of the war from works such as *The Reason Why* as from textbook versions based ultimately on Kinglake.

First of all, *The Reason Why* is a severe indictment of the officer purchase system as it prevailed in the British Army in the 1830's and 1840's under Wellington's protection. Gentlemen of birth but little ability were able to reach high positions of command, as Mrs. Woodham-Smith demonstrates through the lives of two brothers-in-law, the third Earl of Lucan and the seventh Earl of Cardigan, the commanders respectively of the Cavalry Division and its Light Brigade. The Charge of the Light Brigade was the epitome of a poor officer system which, besides breeding incredible incompetence, permitted the extension of a personal hatred of long standing between Lucan and Cardigan. Lord Raglan, the British commander-in-chief in the Crimea, is presented only briefly as another example of the fruits of the system. The author uses 128 pages to get the careers of Lucan and Cardigan down to 1854 and then moves them, in the context of the war, to and through the famous charge. Though she condemns Raglan's orders for being "vague, obscure, the work of an amateur, and an invitation to disaster," she feels that had Lucan and Cardigan "not detested each other so bitterly, had they been able to examine the order together and discuss its meaning, the Light Brigade might have been saved. Alas, thirty years of hatred could not be bridged; each, however, observed perfect military courtesy." The entire narrative is absorbing.

In the United States the book has been reviewed very favorably, Helen Beal Woodward, for instance, finding it "impeccably documented." Only Henry I. Shaw, Jr., suggested criticisms. While giving no hint of factual errors or of inadequate research, he deplored the vivid contrasts in which characters were presented, disliked the use of undocumented quotations, and left the reader to decide whether or not the author's thesis was satisfactory.[2]

In her native Britain Mrs. Woodham-Smith has encountered reviewers more familiar with her subject and more objective in their critiques, though all have paid tribute to her skillful prose. To Professor Cyril Falls, this "high-coloured and, indeed, flamboyant" work has a title which is "misleading" since, Falls believes, Lucan and Cardigan had but a small part in the charge.

2 *Military Affairs*, XIX (1955), 108-109; *Saturday Review*, 15 May 1954, 16.

He objects also to the portrait of Cardigan which gives his weaknesses but "no hint of qualities which won him many friendships." The impressive list of manuscript sources, he correctly notes, were valuable almost wholly for the pre-Crimean phase of the story. As for Raglan's orders being "amateurish," Falls says that such a designation was quite unfair since the orders of Napoleon and Moltke too would appear amateurish "to the trained staff officer of today," the standard used by Mrs. Woodham-Smith.[3] An unsigned review that was otherwise friendly found that *The Reason Why* was "history written with prejudice, and with little attempt at impartiality."[4] Another unsigned review paid tribute to the "vigorous" style, but felt that Raglan was "only slightly and not very convincingly portrayed" and concluded that "although this is a fascinating book, and better worth reading than most novels, Mrs. Woodham-Smith seems to have gone tearing along after her thesis with even more determination and certainly with more success than the Light Brigade after the Russian guns. Perhaps, like them, she has been going for the wrong objective."[5]

Serious as these criticisms are, still others can be made. As Falls implies, if we really want to know "the reason why" the charge occurred, a biography of Raglan would have been more to the point. Such a work would also be an indictment of the system; and though Raglan had no such lurid background as Cardigan or Lucan, he is just as much in need of a biographer. As for the charge itself, Mrs. Woodham-Smith's account makes Raglan's responsibility quite clear as well as showing that Lucan and Cardigan were on their best behavior on that day. Indeed, "thirty years of hatred" were not noticeable when Lucan relayed the order to charge to Cardigan. When Cardigan asked Lucan if he realized its meaning, Lucan replied that he did but that Lord Raglan had ordered it that way. Though quite incompetent and at this time irritated at their situation, both Lucan and Cardigan were resigned to their respective positions in the battle and each did what he saw as his duty. We may reasonably question whether two officers without years of hatred between them would have calmly discussed the meaning of the order or refused to carry it out.

Mrs. Woodham-Smith has consulted an impressive amount of unpublished manuscript sources. Nearly all, however, pertain to the early years of Lucan and Cardigan. The sources from which she drew her story of the charge and the war up to that point are quite routine. There are, moreover, some embarrassing gaps in her list. The Navy Records Society volumes discussed below are omitted, and neither does one find reference to Wrottesley's works on Sir John Burgoyne,[6] a very important source for the early half of the war. Also missing is Totleben's *Defense de Sébastopol* (2 vols., St. Petersburg, 1863-

[3] *History Today*, IV (1954), 67-68.

[4] *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, XXXII (1954), 35. A cardinal point in the book review policy of this journal is that "the shoddy or pretentious should be taken to bits and exposed." See T. H. McGuffie, "The Society for Army Historical Research," *Journal of the Royal United Service Institution*, XCIX (1954), 594-598.

[5] *JRUSI*, XCIX (Feb., 1954), 168.

[6] G. Wrottesley, ed., *Life and Letters of Sir John Burgoyne* (2 vols., London, 1873); and *The Military Opinions of General Sir John Fox Burgoyne* (London, 1859).

74), a standard source. This is only the beginning of what could be a long list of crucial omissions. Her bibliography includes no French language title, aside from Bazancourt's translated anti-British history of the French Expedition to the East. In vain one looks for a number of publications by the French government,[7] the published letters of Bosquet, Saint-Arnaud, and Prince Napoleon,[8] the reminiscences of Cler, Canrobert, Fay and others,[9] as well as for fine monographs such as Maurice Quatrelles L'Epine's *Le maréchal de Saint-Arnaud 1798-1854, d'après sa correspondence et des documents inédits* (2 vols., Paris, 1928-29). These are serious omissions and show up in the author's account of the war. Indeed, from *The Reason Why* one would scarcely know that the French were also in the Crimea. The scant survey of the war's origin reflects a diluted Kinglake and cannot be taken as a serious explanation. She condemns the decision to invade the Crimea as the "utmost recklessness" but gives no discussion of the almost impossible alternatives which the French and British leaders had; and the same kind of treatment characterizes her explanation of the debate on where to land in the Crimea. Totleben's reasons (Vol. I, Part I, 156-157) for his argument that the landing at Old Fort could not have been opposed are convincing, yet Mrs. Woodham-Smith condemns the Russians for not shelling the landing allies with field artillery. Her narrative does not indicate how in nearly every operation in the early phases of the war the French were delayed by the British, as when Saint-Arnaud, chaffing at Old Fort, finally decided to tell Raglan he would wait no longer. Her version of the battle of Alma is particularly unfair to the French. After the flank march she blames the French for the plan to besiege and contends that the British favored an assault. The crucial person here was Burgoyne, to whom Raglan continually turned for advice, but Burgoyne is not mentioned in *The Reason Why*. In short, this work is very far from "impeccably documented," and the failure to consult a host of standard materials has resulted in many errors. In this romantic blending of history and biography, history emerges a poor second. We must, of course, recognize that the author's main focus is on Lucan and Cardigan and that the war is a matter of background until the charge. The aberrations thus appear in the contextual framework and not the core of the work. Perhaps this would not be so objectionable if she did not make such clear and unequivocal misstatements of fact about these subsidiary events. But she does.

The climax of the book, naturally, is the Charge of the Light Brigade. As far as the details of the charge are concerned, Mrs. Woodham-Smith's account is almost identical, even to recorded conversation, to one which ap-

[7] *Siège de Sébastopol: historique du service de l'artillerie*, 1854-1856 (2 vols., Paris, 1859); A. Niel, *Siège de Sébastopol: journal des opérations du génie* (Paris, 1858); and others. Her *Florence Nightingale* also lacks French language titles in the bibliography.

[8] P. F. J. Bosquet, *Lettres du maréchal Bosquet 1830-1858* (Paris, 1894); *Lettres du maréchal Bosquet à sa mère 1829-1858* (4 vols., Pau, 1877-1879); and *Lettres du maréchal Bosquet à ses amis, 1837-1860* (2 vols., Pau, 1879); Leroy de Saint-Arnaud, *Lettres du maréchal Saint-Arnaud* (2 vols., 2nd ed., Paris, 1858); and Ernest d'Hauterive, "Correspondence inédite de Napoléon III et du prince Napoléon," *Revue des Deux Mondes, XVIII* (1923), 763-796, XIX (1924), 51-85, 519-545.

[9] J. J. G. Cler, *Reminiscences of an Officer of Zouaves* (New York, 1860); C. G. Bapst, *Le maréchal Canrobert: souvenirs d'un siècle* (6th ed., 6 vols., Paris, 1912); and C. A. Fay, *Souvenirs de la guerre de Crimée 1854-1856* (Paris, 1867).

peared in 1949.[10] Though she writes infinitely better and does a graphic job on the first half of the battle, she has added nothing to the previously known facts of the charge. The non-specialist, however, will probably be satisfied with *The Reason Why* as vivid and exciting reading; for, indeed, it could well be regarded as the prose equivalent to Tennyson's moving stanzas.

Other recent studies dealing with military aspects of the war have varied in quality. H. P. Collins' survey of the early weeks during which the allied force was in the Crimea brings a number of questions to mind.[11] In hastily describing the allied decision to make the invasion, Collins notes that the Turkish field commander, Omar Pasha, was against the idea but neither tells why nor adds that many others also opposed the plan. His thesis that the allies' swift landing without serious opposition was due to steam power is debatable. The battle of Alma is told with imprecision, and the author implies that after Alma Admiral Lyons would have favored assault by the allies from the north rather than Saint-Arnaud's decision to march around Sebastopol. As a matter of fact, Lyons hailed the circumferential march as a masterstroke. The analysis of the battle of Inkermann (5 Nov. 1854) is acceptable but for one point, the contention that "Inkermann ensured the Allies' ultimate victory." It is more accurate to see the battle in the context of policy for the coming winter, which was the way commanders on all sides saw it. To the Russians it meant failure to relieve the fortress; for the allies, the disruption and discontinuation of their plans for a grand all-out assault on 7 November. To force this discontinuation was the minimum Russian objective, and because it was achieved, a winter siege was forced on the allies, making Inkermann hardly the harbinger of "ultimate victory."

In May of 1855 Lord Raglan finally got the reluctant consent of General Canrobert, the French commander-in-chief in the Crimea, for a joint expedition against the Kertch peninsula and straits. The objective was control of the Sea of Azov. The allied force sailed but, within sight of its goal, word came from Canrobert recalling the French portions of the expedition and indirectly causing the return of the whole force. British tempers flared and recriminations galore fell on the hapless Canrobert. He was allowed to resign and his successor (Pélissier) at once promoted another expedition. This time success was achieved. From published correspondence, James M. Merrill has studied these Kertch expeditions, seeing them particularly as experiments in cooperative naval command.[12] The narrative of events is well written and generally accurate although his evaluation of the importance of the Kertch operation is perhaps another story. To say that it "broke the year-old [?] stalemate before Sevastopol and removed the last obstacle to the complete blockade

[10] F. O. Hitchcock, "The Light Brigade: Was the Blunder Worth While?" *Army Quarterly*, LVIII (July, 1949), 194-204. See also J. Brunon, "Balaclava, la charge de la Brigade Légère," *Revue Historique de l'Armée*, X (1954), 217-240. G. Tylden has unearthed two descriptions of an account of the battle of Balaclava given by an eye-witness, probably W. A. Fox Strangways. These abound in detail and differ in some respects from other published versions of the action. See "The Heavy Cavalry Charge at Balaclava," *JSAHR*, XIX (1940), 98-103; and "Balaclava: 'C' Battery, R. H. A., and the Light Brigade," *JSAHR*, XXII (1944), 260-261.

[11] H. P. Collins, "The Crimea: the Fateful Weeks," AQ, LXXI (Oct., 1955), 86-96.

[12] James M. Merrill, "British-French Amphibious Operations in the Sea of Azov, 1855," *MA*, XX (1956), 16-27.

of the city" is to overlook the decisive effect of the battle of Tchernaya. Merrill has made Canrobert out as something of a comic fool who constantly made errors; that Napoleon III and the telegraph were the real villains responsible for the recall of the first expedition hardly emerges from this account. Also unappreciated is the fact that Pélissier's initiative with the second expedition was closely akin to insubordination and placed the Emperor in an embarrassing position. Canrobert's retirement was the result of a long period of worsening relations with the British, with the anger over his recall of the first Kertch expedition being the figurative last straw, though again the reader must read elsewhere for this conclusion. The basic importance of the success against Kertch was that it re-established good relations between the French and British commanders-in-chief in the Crimea, and this far outweighed the damage done to the Russians, important though this latter may have been. All this is not to detract from Merrill's success in handling his task. Indeed, this type of study, but one following more closely the advice of Richard Glover in his "War and Civilian Historians,"[13] is sorely needed for the allied command during the entire war.

While the focal point of the struggle came to be the siege at Sebastopol, there were also some interesting sidelights. Florence Nightingale's work has become legendary, but relatively few people, perhaps, have ever heard of the grotesque and barbaric Bashi-Bazouks. At the outbreak of the war thousands of Ottoman semi-nomadic bandit-types descended on Constantinople to volunteer as irregular cavalry. Both the French and British took a number of these and endeavored to give them some effective training. The French soon gave up a hopeless task but the British persisted with and were plagued by the Bashis throughout the war. Their problems in trying to command and train these Ottoman rogues are now the heart of a short essay by M. E. S. Laws,[14] who observes that all three of their successive commanders believed that with sufficient support from Raglan or the government in London they could have made effective units out of the Bashis. This backing, however, they never received.

A different type of story has appeared in the letters of Henry Clifford,[15] aide-de-camp to a brigade commander. Henry Clifford fought at Alma and Inkermann and in the last assault on Sebastopol. He watched the exciting charges of the Heavy and Light Brigades in the battle of Balaclava and also witnessed the crucial engagement at Traktir bridge. Thus he was in or near the center of action during most of the war and his letters from 30 May 1854 to November 1855 form a continuous and colorful narrative of this phase of his life and of the suffering about him. The documentary exposition he gives us between November 1855 and 18 April 1856 is intermittent but no less important. Thirty-five sketches, five in color, reproduced from his sketchbook, add another dimension to the value of the work. Although much of what Clifford reports can be found elsewhere, some passages are particularly revealing. His letters give fine documentation for the harsh treatment which

[13] *JHI*, XVIII (1957), 84-100.

[14] M. E. S. Laws, "Beatson's Bashi-Bazooks," AQ, LXXI (1955), 80-85.

[15] *Henry Clifford V. C., His Letters and Sketches from the Crimea* (Toronto, 1956). Edited by Clifford's grandson.

Turkish troops received from the French and British. He condemned Raglan and praised the French during the gruelling winter of 1854-55; but by 18 March 1855, except for the zouaves and chausseurs de Vincennes, he valued the French less the more he saw of them. On 13 February 1855, he reports that after the British were "bold enough" to fire two big guns, the Russians answered with fifty-two.

His letters tell of a number of rumors circulating among the lower officers and some of these are in print for the first time. He writes that Canrobert, while planning another attack after a serious repulse on 24 February 1855, considered asking for a British regiment to help, "but Bosquet would not stand for it, and said the insult would be too great to the French Army." Clifford heard this from French officers and believed, perhaps correctly, that it might be true. The story is characteristic of Bosquet and it would be typical for Canrobert to refuse Raglan's offer of aid because of Bosquet's insistence rather than his own conviction. We knew before that Raglan had offered aid which Canrobert refused, but had no satisfactory explanation why, after extensive preparations, the French never did counterattack. Clifford has provided evidence which, if it does not solve the main question, at least adds another dimension to Canrobert's position. In this instance, as in many others, Clifford's observations are as pertinent for the story of the French army in the Crimea as for the British.[16]

The most important collection of letters to appear since 1943 are three Navy Records Society volumes containing the Admiralty correspondence with Vice-Admirals Sir Charles Napier and Sir James Dean Dundas, and Rear-Admirals Sir Richard Saunders Dundas and Sir Edmund Lyons.[17] The letters concerning events of 1855 in the Baltic constitute a basic source, while those for the Baltic in 1854 are merely interesting, containing little not already available in newspaper files or the personal writing of Napier attacking Sir James Graham, then First Lord of the Admiralty. The James Dundas correspondence sheds some light on minor operations in the Black Sea, but unfortunately little is revealed on a number of unanswered questions regarding allied naval policy while he was in command. The Admiralty correspondence with his successor, Edmund Lyons, is the most significant of the lot. Lyons emerges as a stronger and wiser person than evidence heretofore suggested and several incidents (including recall of the first Kertch expedition) can now be sketched in more clearly. The three volumes as a whole are a valuable source for a crucial point in naval history (conversion from sail to steam,

16 Clifford's letters typify over 60 others which have appeared since 1942. See H. Wyndham, ed., "Some Crimean Letters," AQ, L (1945), 276-280; LI (1945-46), 128-133, 285-287; LII (1946), 132-136. Also R. M. Grazebrook, ed., "Letters from Sebastopol, 1855," *JSAHR*, XXXII (1954), 30-33; G. Tylden, ed., "The Crimea in 1855 and 1856," *JSAHR*, XXV (1947), 23-26; H. Biddulph, ed., "The Expedition to Kertch, 1855," *JSAHR*, XXI (1942), 128-135; "The Assault on the Redan, 18th June, 1855," *JSAHR*, XXI (1942), 52-54; and "The Fall of Sebastopol," *JSAHR*, XIX (1940), 197-199. See also T. J. Lancaster's letter from Scutari on November 10, 1854, "A Letter from the Crimea," *Fortnightly*, November, 1954, 336-337; and A. H. Taylor, "Letters from the Crimea," *JRUSI*, CII (1957), 79-85, 232-238, and 399-405. These are Parts I, II, and III; more are in process of publication.

17 D. Bonner-Smith and A. C. Dewar, eds., *Russian War, 1854: Baltic and Black Sea Official Correspondence* (London, 1943); D. Bonner-Smith, ed., *Russian War, 1855: Baltic Official Correspondence* (London, 1944); and A. C. Dewar, ed., *Russian War, 1855: Black Sea Official Correspondence* (London, 1945).

armor plate) and complement nicely the many volumes of Crimean letters by people ashore, both French and British. In a war where the allied navies played such a prominent role, these documents are the first which give real insight into the upper-echelon command problems of Britain's naval officers in the Black Sea. A similar collection on the French admirals would complete the last great gap in the documentary record of the war.

In scientific development both the French and the British made significant advances in many areas, many still awaiting treatment. After careful research, Michael Robbins has been able to tell the elusive story of the railway which the British built from Balaclava to their front lines.[18] Extending about seven miles and rising 660 feet, this was the first use of the railroad in the face of an enemy. The impact of technology on naval development is a theme in two general articles by R. F. Colvile.[19] There were serious problems of personnel as shortages of trained officers and sailors could not be made up by those coming out of retirement. While the British successfully adopted Napoleon III's idea to make floating batteries by placing iron plates over "wooden walls," Colvile notes that fourteen years earlier Sir Charles Napier had suggested the same thing to an unsympathetic Admiralty.

The effect of the Crimean War on industry and municipal development has attracted very little scholarly attention, though perhaps now a beginning has been made with the city of Sheffield. W. H. G. Armytage has studied the relationship of British objectives during the war to Sheffield's politics, industrial disputes, and industrial development;[20] and Asa Briggs has reminded us that it was one of Sheffield's members in the House of Commons, the aggressive Radical, John Arthur Roebuck, whose motion for a select committee to investigate the conduct of the war brought down the Aberdeen government.[21] Briggs feels that "the unpopularity of John Bright in Manchester, when he opposed the war, and the wild popularity of John Arthur Roebuck in Sheffield, when he supported it, reveal more of the England of their time than the elaborate accounts by ministers of the aims and purposes of the struggle."

While Briggs convincingly maintains that the war had a "profound impact on British politics, government, and society," he is not on safe ground when he remarks that "The war itself was without a real decision in the field of international politics." This statement is true only in the narrow sense that Russia was not soundly beaten. In a wider sense the Crimean War was ex-

18 M. Robbins, "The Balaclava Railway," *Journal of Transport History*, I (1953), 28-43; and II (1955), 51-52 for "A Footnote" to the above. A very interesting technical work explains the state of meteorological study and practice in the 1850's and, relying on old data, presents a modern weather map for the fateful hurricane of 14 November 1854. See H. Landsberg, "Storm of Balaclava and the Daily Weather Forecast," *Scientific Monthly*, December, 1954, 347-352.

19 R. F. Colvile, "The Navy and the Crimean War," *JRUSI*, LXXXV (1940), 73-78; and "The Baltic as a Theatre of War: the Campaign of 1854," *JRUSI*, LXXXVI (1941), 72-80. See also Wilhelm Treue's *Der Krimkrieg und die Entstehung der Modernen Flotten* (Göttingen, 1954) and my review in *Journal of Modern History*, XXVII (1955), 204.

20 W. H. G. Armytage, "Sheffield and the Crimean War: Politics and Industry 1852-1857," *HT*, V (1955), 473-482.

21 Asa Briggs, *Victorian People: a Reassessment of Persons and Themes 1851-1867* (Chicago, 1955), pp. 52-86, 197-231.

tremely important in the history of nineteenth-century Europe. There can be little doubt that the real stake in the Crimean War, as A. J. P. Taylor indicates, was central Europe, more specifically, Germany and Italy.[22] The policies which previously found Austria, Prussia, and Russia acting in concert failed to survive 1854. The backbone of Europe's diplomatic structure was broken and no ready-made substitute was at hand to take its place. The world of *realpolitik* of the mid-nineteenth century proved to be one in which Austria alone could not effectively resist concessions to nationalism, for, with each state standing alone, Austria was left unaided to deal with "the revolution," that is, nationalistic movements within and near her borders. The Crimean War thus was of major importance in the diplomatic story of both German and Italian unification. This truth was recognized by persons as far apart as Napoleon III (in early 1854) and Russia's apologist, Alexander Jomini.[23] A. J. P. Taylor's analysis is generally sound and reflects a wide knowledge of sources. To write a monograph tracing European diplomatic history from 1848 to 1918, as Taylor has, is a prodigious task; and no critical comment should be construed as failing to appreciate an impressive accomplishment. The state of current research on the origins of the war, however, can hardly support the generalization that, regarding French policy towards the Ottoman empire, "Napoleon III could not resist the appeal to adventure." Also to account adequately for British involvement in the war needs perhaps more attention to the domestic political scene than Taylor allows.

The Crimean War was misunderstood for decades, largely as a result of Kinglake's account.[24] For historians to escape the anti-French and pro-Raglan influence of Kinglake has been exceedingly difficult, but the increasing bulk of additional documentation has gradually made itself felt so that we now have a much sounder view of the war and its participants. Lord Raglan was something distinctly less than the hero Kinglake saw and the Emperor of the French not nearly so much the villain. The amount of revision has indeed been substantial.[25]

BRISON D. GOOCH

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

22 A. J. P. Taylor, *The Struggle for Mastery in Europe, 1848-1918* (Oxford, 1954), pp. 49-86. See also Asa Briggs, "Crimean Centenary," *Virginia Quarterly Review*, XXX (1954), 543-547; and Georg Franz, "Der Krimkrieg, ein Wendepunkt des Europäischen Schicksals," *Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht*, VII (1956), 448-463.

23 Alexandre Jomini, *Etude diplomatique sur la guerre de Crimée (1852 à 1856)* (2 vols., St. Petersburg, 1878), I, 32-33; and Ernest II, Duke of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, *Memoirs of Ernest II* (4 vols., London, 1890), III, 58-90.

24 Gavin B. Henderson, *Crimean War Diplomacy and Other Historical Essays* (Glasgow, 1947), p. 243. These essays are among the finest recent monographs on the war.

25 See my "A Century of Historiography on the Origins of the Crimean War," *AHR*, LXII (1956), 33-58, with bibliographical footnotes. The centennial of the war called forth a host of minor works which are briefly described and evaluated in the notes to the above or in recent numbers of *Historical Abstracts*.

from *The Tichborne Claimant*, reviewed on p. 284

BOOK REVIEWS

282 *Noel Annan* : **Jowett** by GEOFFREY FABER

284 *Norman St. John-Stevas* : **The Tichborne Claimant** by DOUGLAS WOODRUFF
: **The Claimant** by MICHAEL GILBERT
: **The Tichborne Imposter** by GEDDES MACGREGOR

286 *R. K. Webb* : **The English Common Reader** by RICHARD D. ALTICK

288 *Monroe Engel* : **Dickens at Work** by BUTT and TILLOTSON

289 *G. Robert Stange* : **The Bow and the Lyre** by ROMA A. KING, JR.

290 *S. Lilley* : **The Organisation of Science in England** by D. S. L. CARDWELL

292 *Hill Shine* : **The Saint-Simonians, Mill, and Carlyle** by R. K. P. PANKHURST

293 *Richard H. Shryock* : **The Evolution of Medical Education in the Nineteenth Century** by CHARLES NEWMAN

294 *W. H. G. Armytage* : **George Birkbeck** by THOMAS KELLY
: **Pioneers of Popular Education, 1760-1850** by H. M. POLLARD

295 *T. S. R. Boase* : **The Stones of Manchester** by CECIL STEWART
: **The Architecture of Victorian Sydney** by MORTON HERMAN

296 *H. J. Fleure* : **Pioneer of Sociology** by PHILIPPE MAIRET

297 *G. B. L. Wilson* : **Victorian Ballet Girl** by IVOR GUEST

298 *Kenneth Kirkwood* : **Baden-Powell** by E. E. REYNOLDS
: **Twenty-Seven Years with Baden-Powell** by E. K. WADE
: **Baden-Powell at Mafeking** by DUNCAN GRINNELL-MILNE

300 *William D. Templeman* : **Onward Christian Soldier** by WILLIAM PURCELL

301 *Oscar Maurer* : **A History of Punch** by R. G. G. PRICE

302 *Karl Litzenberg* : **Hans Andersen and Charles Dickens** by ELIAS BREDSDORFF

302 *Myrtle Pihlman Pope* : **The Man Has Wings** by FRANCIS THOMPSON, ed. CONNOLLY

Jowett: A Portrait with Background, by Geoffrey Faber; pp. 456. Faber and Faber: London, 1957, 30s.; Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Mass., 1957, $6.00.

In 1933 Sir Geoffrey Faber made a notable addition to Victorian studies. *Oxford Apostles* was an outstanding attempt to get inside the minds of the young Tractarians, and the book showed a masterly grasp of the Tractarian disposition of mind – the High and Dry doctrine of Lloyd at Christ Church, the Noetic philosophy of Oriel, and the consequences of returning to the Early Fathers. It was also a fine picture of the mind of the young Newman: so that when the crescendo of his conversion began ("I saw my face in that mirror, and I was a Monophysite"), it was for the reader a comprehensible development of his personality and intelligence, not the occasion for mocking laughter. In this new book one is bound to ask, has Faber done for Jowett what he did for Froude and Newman?

The answer is that he has not. And perhaps the main reason is that the author has become the prisoner of scholarly pretensions. We are not presented with the narrative of Jowett's life nor yet with an attempt to place him in his age. Faced with the fact that the standard biography of Jowett by Abbott and Campbell is an excellent and informative work, Faber's first object is to pick a quarrel with it. It was, he declares, written with a false perspective, Abbott having forced Campbell to write the first volume as a prolegomenon to the triumphant period of Jowett's Mastership at Balliol, which is described at inordinate length in the second volume. Well, this may be so; but why does Faber consider the young Jowett so important? The answer is that "the claim that he should be considered a great man rests, finally, not upon his external achievements (great as they were) but upon the quality of the man himself." Jowett himself – not the Master of Balliol or the Broad Churchman or the university reformer – is the subject of the book. And to substantiate the claim that Jowett was a great man is the object of the book. In trying to achieve this object Faber is forever pausing to destroy this legend or abolish that myth; to fulminate against Strachey or put mistaken contemporary observers to rights; or to fog-horn away for a considerable length of time on a number of subjects such as the nature of greatness, the importance of the classics, or the duties of teachers: so that the book consists of a series of military engagements as one objection after another to Jowett's claim to greatness is overthrown. Evidence is accumulated and one set of opinions weighed against another in a very proper manner; but after a while one feels that the amount of space spent on these bouts of scholarship is disproportionate to what is being achieved and if only Jowett had been left to speak for himself through his letters and writings, more of the man, great or not great, would have appeared.

I am afraid that the scholarship is not always sound. It doesn't matter that Jowett, born in April 1817, is described as a boy of *eleven* when he entered St. Paul's School in June 1829. Nor is it more than a slip to record the date of Jowett's being offered the Regius Chair of Greek as 1854 when it was in fact 1855. But, curiously enough, it is on religious opinion that the author of *Oxford Apostles* is shaky. In the footnote on page 224 Faber criticises the biographer of Pusey who defended his subject's attacks on Jowett by pleading that the Tractarian had suffered in his youth at the hands of Liberals. "Who were the Liberals," asks Faber, "from whom the Puseyites had suffered 'twenty years earlier'? The fight, then, was between the orthodox Evangelicals and the Tractarians. The Liberal party in the Church at that time was little more than dogs' meat." This is to forget Whately and the Noetics; not to see that the reference to Liberals could mean the Whig Erastians or bishops such as Blomfield of London; to underestimate the continuing strength of eighteenth-century Latitudinarianism; and to confuse the Low and Slow party in the Church (to which Sidney Smith belonged) with – in the thirties – the comparatively small party of Evangelicals. No one should generalise about Victorian Anglicanism unless he has read, as Faber presumably has not, W. J. Conybeare's discussion of Church parties in his *Essays Ecclesiastical and Social* (1855) or his article in *Macmillan's Magazine* (Dec. 1860) on the Evangelical clergy; and no one should write loosely about Evangelicalism until he has read Charles Smyth's essay on the Evangelical Movement in the *Cambridge Historical Journal* (1943). Or

again, Faber begins his account of *Essays and Reviews* by denigrating Temple's essay as a "forced and foolish interpretation of history" and as "sad rubbish." But the essay is no more than an echo of the Liberal Anglicanism which Duncan Forbes explored in his book published in 1952: it is a compression of arguments used by Arnold, Thirlwall and Milman – Liberals who certainly existed when Pusey was a young man – and whose brand of theological history may appear rubbish today but must be judged in relation to its age. This lack of intimate understanding of the history of Victorian religion vitiated for me the chapters on Jowett's theological writings. I can only suppose that in his busy life as a publisher Faber has forgotten part of what he learnt about Victorian religion twenty-five years ago and has not had the time (as his bibliography suggests) to keep up with what scholars have published on the subject since then.

Again Faber makes the sound point that Jowett's Balliol was succeeded by a different kind of Balliol – the Balliol of A. L. Smith and of A. D. Lindsay – which concerned itself with working-class education and welfare, and was earnest, austere, and dedicated to socialism. But he suggests that the change came on Jowett's death when Caird was elected Master instead of Strachan-Davidson, who stood in the Jowett tradition. Yet the change surely did not come until after the first World War: until then – and even after – the two traditions existed side by side. There was plenty of aristocratic influence, such as Jowett loved, among the undergraduates until 1914, and Bailey and Urquhart were both dons after Jowett's heart.

Faber has, of course, done an excellent job in re-examining Jowett as a man. He has added to our knowledge of Jowett's life in that he has used with great success passages from his letters which his official biographers understandably omitted and also the notes which Jowett made in private and left among his papers. He argues that the lonely unloved boy – the son of improvident, shiftless parents – searched throughout his life for some intimate loving friendship and never quite succeeded in obtaining it: never succeeded partly because of a shyness which he could never overcome and partly because he was sexually under-developed. Faber surmises that the boy who at Balliol was called "Miss Jowett" may have had homosexual advances made to him at school and thereafter was so repelled that he falsified the sense of passages in the *Symposium* and the *Phaedrus* when working on Plato and regarded the practice with horror. Yet he became deeply attached to one of his early pupils, Morier, a genial giant who subsequently became British Ambassador at St. Petersburg, and J. A. Symonds was his friend. At one time it seemed as if Arthur Stanley, with whom he worked closely on the Epistles, would supply the want. But Stanley, who himself leant for support first on his headmaster, Arnold, and then on his mother, found Jowett too adventuresome an intellectual influence: he was too firmly entrenched in the respectability of the upper classes and rebuffed his friend, their partnership ending in the fifties. At the beginning of the sixties Jowett began to contemplate marriage with Margaret Elliott, the daughter of the Dean of Bristol; but he could not obtain the one Fellowship at Balliol which could be held by a married man, and by the time he became Master, Miss Elliott, with whom he had never been in love (though in whom by Victorian standards he must have aroused expectations), had been dropped because he had been captivated by Florence Nightingale. With her he had a long and devoted friendship: whether it was love – and what love would have meant to Jowett – Faber wisely admits cannot be divined. But with it went all ideas of marriage and he acknowledged that "the great want of life can never be supplied, and I must do without it."

This new material is excellently handled. But it seems to me not to add anything to the question to which Faber continually returns: was Jowett a great man? He was unquestionably a great don. Balliol owes its leading position among Oxford and Cambridge colleges to Jowett. Parsons and Jenkyns at the beginning of the century had cleared the ground and rectified the grosser eighteenth-century abuses and made possible the election of Fellows on their merits. There were, too, able tutors before Jowett, but it was he who, at the time when Oriel lost its pre-eminence as an intellectual centre owing to the personal factions and strains set up by the Tractarians within its walls, enabled Bal-

liol to take its place. He did so by the excellence of his teaching and his influence over his pupils. He taught them the secret and the delight of hard work. He stimulated them to think for themselves. He devoted hours to them, and soon his fame spread beyond Oxford to the schools. He was to the colleges what Arnold was to the public schools: the symbol of a moral revolution. Just as Arnold made few innovations in the curriculum and certainly had nothing to do with the cult of games, so Jowett is credited with changes which came later. He stuck to catechetical construe and, though he made Plato live again in Oxford, he was appalled by the influence which T. H. Green's metaphysics had upon the young. He was too shy and formidable to talk to his pupils on anything approaching equal terms and indeed rebuked a Fellow for being too intimate with the undergraduates. But Jowett marked the beginning of the new dispensation whereby dons learnt to sympathise with undergraduate pleasures and were no longer regarded as fossils. Soon the public schools followed Rugby's lead and the Balliol scholarships became the blue riband for their best boys; and though Jowett had a weakness for peers, the Scottish connection provided Balliol with poor hard-working Scots boys to leaven the well-born.

Faber's destruction of the ancient jibe that Jowett was a snob who cared only for success is thorough and convincing. He is also scrupulous in assessing Jowett's achievements as a reformer of Oxford education and as a Broad Churchman: he does not claim too much, and he makes the reader agree that it is unfair to blame the man who braved odium and persecution in the sixties for no longer being in the vanguard in the eighties. What Jowett argued – that the doctrine of the Atonement cannot be understood through a crude version of the theory of Penal Substitution and that the Bible is subject to the same canons of criticism as any other document – is a commonplace among nearly all theologians today; and if in fact Maurice, and not Jowett, was the seminal mind among mid-Victorian theologians, this does not destroy the reputation of a man who knew only too well his own intellectual limitations.

Nevertheless, as I have suggested above, Jowett's contribution to liberal theology and university reform is not adequately presented. No sustained account of the mid-Victorian predicament in either of these fields is attempted. We are simply given the routine explanation that, for instance, the universities needed to be reformed; but unless we are told what dilemmas faced the reformers, how they differed from each other, what valid arguments by the conservatives impeded or modified their proposals, and how Jowett's work relates to Victorian educational ideals, it is impossible to estimate his significance. This part of the book is as disappointing for scholars as the biographical part is new and refreshing.

Indeed Jowett is not as neglected or misunderstood, at any rate by scholars, as Faber likes to suggest. But if his reputation is lower than that of other contemporaries it is because a doubt existed in his own generation and in ours that he cared for the intellect and what the intellect can achieve. He hated research, he was uninterested in method, and as a result the adult scholar was apt to despise him. At his best Jowett is saying that truth is never simple and learning is justified so long as it teaches tolerance and reconciles things which are apparently opposite. This is not enough. It is not his lack of achievement but his lack of belief in the value of learning and knowledge that lessens his stature. Faber would disagree with this judgment; and his re-assessment of Jowett is worth reading as an exercise in biographical judgment as well as for the sound sympathy with the man himself which it displays.

NOEL ANNAN,
King's College, Cambridge

The Tichborne Claimant: A Victorian Mystery, by DOUGLAS WOODRUFF; pp. xx + 479. Farrar, Straus and Cudahy: New York, 1957, $4.75; Hollis and Carter: London, 1957, 30s.
The Claimant, by MICHAEL GILBERT; pp. viii + 224. Constable: London, 1957, 18s. 6d.; Longmans: Toronto, 1957, $3.75.
The Tichborne Imposter, by GEDDES MACGREGOR; pp. 288. Lippincott: Philadelphia, 1957, $3.95.

IN SEVENTY-FIVE YEARS, apart from J. B. Atlay's amusing sketch and Lord Maugham's legal account, nothing of importance has been published on the Tichborne case, and it is ironic – and mortifying for the authors – that

recently three books on the subject should be published almost simultaneously. Mr. Woodruff's book, the fruit of half a lifetime's reflection and research, scholarly, clear, and impartial, is incomparably the best of the three, but it should not eclipse Mr. Gilbert's excellent short account, as much a study of the characters of those involved in the trial as of the case itself. Mr. MacGregor's book, partisan and uneven, is a poor third, and exhibits the fault, unpardonable even in a popular work, of confusing historic fact with the product of the author's own imagination.

The Tichbornes, one of England's oldest Catholic families, famous for the Tichborne *dole* and a family curse, trace their descent to pre-Norman times. On April 20, 1859, Roger Tichborne, heir to the tenth baronet, boarded the *Bella* at Rio de Janiero and set sail for New York on one stage of an extended foreign tour. From that date the ship was neither heard of nor seen again; Roger was presumed drowned; and in 1862, on the death of his father, Roger's younger brother, Alfred, succeeded to the title and estates. Roger's mother, an eccentric Frenchwoman, never accepted the fact of her eldest son's death, and in 1865, fortified by the assurance of a Paris clairvoyant that Roger was alive on a distant island, she advertised for him in a number of Australian papers, where rumour had long maintained that survivors from the *Bella* had found their way. A claimant soon came forward — in view of the glowing terms of the advertisement it is strange that there was only one — and on Christmas Day, 1866, he landed in England to claim his inheritance. The Tichborne case had begun. For five years, forces gathered for and against the Claimant, and in May, 1871, the civil trial opened, destined with the ensuing criminal proceedings to hold Victorian England agog for the next three years. The official court records alone run to more than 10,000 printed pages: the Tichborne family spent £92,000 to defeat the Claimant, the Government £150,000 to imprison him: it was, without exaggeration, the greatest impersonation case in common law history.

The Claimant was at once accepted by Sir Roger's mother as her missing son. He was further supported by Bogle, Roger's incorruptible old negro manservant; Mr. Hopkins, the family solicitor; and Mr. Baigent, a Catholic antiquarian and authority on the Tichborne family. Other believers were Roger's regimental batman and groom, a number of brother officers, and a host of country and professional gentlemen. Furthermore, the Claimant was an excellent shot and a dab fly fisher, strange accomplishments for the Wapping butcher, Arthur Orton, whom his opponents alleged him to be. Against the Claimant were the rest of the Tichborne family, Roger's cousin and fiancée, Kate Doughty, and Vincent Gosford, his steward and confidant. Another handicap was the Claimant's figure; his enormous bulk turned the scales at twenty-seven stone, and it lacked the tattoo marks alleged to have adorned the vanished Roger's slim form. The Claimant was manifestly illiterate, lacked even a smattering of his first language French, knew nothing of his school Stonyhurst, placed Winchester in Yorkshire, confused a troop with a squadron, maintained that Caesar wrote his commentaries in Greek, and invoked the Blessed Virgin to have mercy on his mother's soul while she was still alive! The very night he reached London, he paid a clandestine visit to Wapping to inquire of the Orton family, of whom he showed a remarkable knowledge, and despite his being swathed in a heavy muffler, he was recognised as the missing Arthur Orton, who had migrated to Australia many years before. Finally, he outraged the middle-class jury and judiciary by maintaining that he had seduced his fiancée, Kate Doughty, by this time a respectable married woman. Having lost the civil action, the Claimant was arraigned for perjury, and sentenced to fourteen years penal servitude. Mr. MacGregor, as indicated by his book's flamboyant title, and Mr. Gilbert, in his final chapter, both approve the result. Mr. Woodruff is more circumspect. Victorian justice was an expensive commodity, and Mr. Woodruff stresses that owing to inadequate funds and a demented counsel, Edward Kenealy, the plaintiff's case at the criminal trial was never adequately presented. Furthermore, the Claimant's star witness, Sir Roger's mother, had died before the civil trial, and he was left with the pale support of her affidavits. Mr. Woodruff concedes that the Claimant's lies and prevarications justly deprived him of the estates, but a fairer verdict would have been: "No estates but no penal servitude; the Crown as well as

the Claimant non suited, its case not proven."

The Tichborne Case is more than a Victorian mystery, for it affords some fascinating insights into the political and social life of late nineteenth-century England. Lord Maugham went so far as to compare it with the Dreyfus case in France and that of Sacco and Vanzetti in the United States, and it certainly prefigured the twentieth-century struggle of the classes against the masses. 1867 was the year of the Second Reform Act, Disraeli's "leap in the dark" which enfranchised the English artisans, who by the time of the trial were frustrated and exasperated that their social and political influence was in no way commensurate with their theoretical electoral power. This was the class to whom the Claimant appealed in a nation-wide campaign between the trials, presenting himself as a common man unjustly deprived of his rights by the wealthy and property-owning classes. The ridicule heaped on him by his opponents for his vulgarities and his lack of breeding served only to confirm this impression. The landowners also recognised the Case as an attack on their most cherished rights. If the Claimant succeeded, whose estates would be safe? Yet the Tichborne Case never divided the nation with the hatred and violence of the French and American cases, and it left no residue of bitterness behind it. A later generation of radicals could weep no tears for an individual's loss of an annual income of £20,000, when they denied the validity of such a right. Any distillation of social venom was effectively neutralised by the Case's quality as a spectacle in a period which lacked television and popular papers and had few national sporting events. The court was thronged with fashionable spectators, ranging from the American Minister to the Emperor of Brazil, and a single day's bag included Prince Christian, the Duke of Teck, Princess Mary Adelaide, and the Duchess of Cambridge. The innumerable wagers, the animated public house debates, the sale of Tichborne bonds — all testified that the nation was divided as much on a sporting issue, anticipating the later Oxford and Cambridge boat race, as on that of class feeling. Religious issues also played their part in the case, and the constant undercurrent of opinion, brought into the open by Dr. Kenealy in a desperate attempt to sway the jury in the criminal trial, that the Jesuits were conspiring to exclude the far-from-orthodox Claimant from the family property, is an interesting commentary on the nation's reaction to the new and self-confident Catholicism, epitomised from 1865 onward in the person of Cardinal Manning.

The Claimant, apart from a later repudiated newspaper confession made for financial reasons, maintained his legitimacy to the end, and was buried in an outsize coffin bearing the name Sir Roger Charles Doughty Tichborne. Certainly he bore the appalling sufferings of his later years with a patience and dignity worthy of the highest standards of English breeding. Having read these three books, no unbiassed reader could conclude that the mystery has been solved. Mr. Woodruff's conclusion must be allowed to speak for itself. "The great doubt still hangs suspended. Probably for ever now, its key long since lost amidst the irresponsible lawlessness, deceptions and transient aliases, and the homicides, of the mid-Victorian Australian bush, a mystery remains; and the strange enigma of the man who lost himself still walks in history with no other name than that which the common voice of his day accorded him: the Claimant." NORMAN ST. JOHN-STEVAS, *Christ Church, Oxford*

The English Common Reader: A Social History of the Mass Reading Public, 1800-1900, by RICHARD D. ALTICK; pp. ix + 430. University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1957, $6.00; Cambridge University Press: London, 1957, 45s.

PROFESSOR ALTICK HAS UNDERTAKEN a difficult task — a history of the growth of a mass reading public in nineteenth-century England — and he has done it very well. The subject is hard to define, and if, once in a while, Mr. Altick's common reader escapes him, it is the most forgiveable of faults. There is another order of difficulty in the nature of the materials with which he had to work. Titles, surviving copies, runs of periodicals mean little without asking "Who read them?", and with this nearly unanswerable question Mr. Altick deals helpfully. In doing it, he had to read a mass of deadly stuff; for that he deserves gratitude from generations of students who will never need to plow through

some of these things again, or at least through so many of them.

In an altogether admirable introduction, Mr. Altick makes his difficulties clear and modestly disclaims to have written a definitive book. As he says, there are hundreds of topics which need to be studied before such a book can be written. But with a good general survey done, we can hope for the research which will provide some day the still more solid foundations for an understanding of Victorian popular culture. Local situations, provincial booksellers, obscure publishers, libraries, schools, and improvement societies need attention now, not the threat of literacy or the challenge of the rotary press.

Anyone familiar with aspects of the subject will find reasons to quarrel with the author over omissions and emphasis. For example, I think he has paid insufficient attention to the influence of men like Richard Carlile and to the huge audience and distinctive functions of papers such as the *Family Herald* or *Illustrated London News*. Mr. Altick candidly admits that his proportion and emphasis are arguable, but it seems to me that some of the disagreement can be referred not simply to choice or interest but to major conceptual and organizational problems too.

To begin with, the organization of the book is conventional. Three chapters sketch the story of the reading public through the eighteenth century. From 1800, Mr. Altick employs a topical approach, looking first at social, religious, and intellectual backgrounds; then at education, public libraries, mechanics' institutions, and the self-made reader; then at the book trade before and after 1850 and at the periodical press. A final suggestive chapter links the past with the present. Clearly such a plan reinforces the tendency which derives from the surviving sources to concentrate on the mechanics and machinery of reading. To be sure, limitations of space forbade attention to the content of most of the publications with which he deals, but the content and tone of the radical political papers or of the improving magazines might have suggested some useful canons of interpretation which are missed.

Not that he goes badly astray. The value of a first reasonably full social history of the mass reading public must lie in the correctness with which it induces the historical logic of the development of this public. By and large, this is well done. Laments about the baleful effects of a growing uncultured reading public have been remarkably similar in tone and content from Coleridge to the present, but they are not very good sources of criteria for evaluation. Mr. Altick manages to avoid such calamity-howling. He knows that the expansion of the reading public must be seen as an historical phenomenon rather than as a missed opportunity or a cultural disaster. He knows too, I think, though he does not make it very explicit, that the new reading public was an apparently inevitable concomitant of technological and democratic change. But I cannot help feeling that these views are conclusions rather than convictions, incidents rather than determinants of his argument.

On the other hand, to have chosen such a thematic approach might have involved him in a more nearly polemical position, and it is one of the virtues of this book that it avoids the unfortunate polemics which make historical nonsense of Mrs. Leavis' challenging and exasperating *Fiction and the Reading Public*. At least Mr. Altick has no villains. His just and temperate picture grows out of a creed (stated in the introduction) which is optimistic, democratic, and admirable. But if such a tack is infinitely preferable to that of most writers on the subject, it has pitfalls of its own. One of them is the gentle curse of whiggery, an unconscious use of twentieth-century standards, which robs his discussion of education of authority and twists his analysis of utilitarianism. To take an example, on page 143 Mr. Altick says, "The function of [educational] reform was to strengthen the English social structure, not to enrich people's intellectual or emotional lives." He explains, that is, but implicitly criticizes. The statement is true, the tone rings false.

Such momentary lapses are akin to another subtler and more pervasive bias, arising, I suspect, from the author's profession. Literature is at a terrible disadvantage compared with the other arts. The basic skill which it uses is and must be much more widely employed in non-artistic, purely functional activities – from reading "No Trespassing" signs, ledgers, and technical journals, to the

consumption of magazines, newspapers, and a good many books. Most of the less obviously utilitarian reading in Victorian or present-day society is still utilitarian – it conveys information of immediate, transient importance; it gets people from one place to another or from one hour to the next; often its greatest advantage is that it can be put down. To demand that a reading public display more than this limited sort of utility is literary and intellectual aggression against the innocent, whose only offence sometimes is lack of pretension. To say this is not to deny the claims of literary culture or to preclude a wide and not unhopeful field for its extension; it is simply a call for careful definition and perspective.

On the whole, Mr. Altick does well in this interpretative dilemma. He quotes that wonderful, petulant outburst of Dickens': "The English are, so far as I know, the hardest-worked people on whom the sun shines. Be content if, in their wretched intervals of leisure, they read for amusement and do no worse. They are born at the oar, and they live and die at it. Good God, what would we have of them!" Because he realizes the truth in this, he has written a good book. But he cannot help wishing that his English common readers were better than they were. Regrets will not down, and reticences detract from the fuller impact and juster proportion he could give. The respectable irresistibly gets the better of it. Anyone who reads this book will know that Mr. Altick is a professor of English literature.

R. K. Webb,
Columbia University

Dickens at Work, by John Butt and Kathleen Tillotson; pp. 238. Methuen: London, 1957, 25s.

Since Forster and Kitton few students of Dickens have taken cognizance of his working notes bound in with the manuscripts in the Victoria and Albert Museum. This neglect, though hardly disastrous, has surely been slovenly. But now Professor Butt and Mrs. Tillotson have turned their attention to these notes, as well as to changes made in proof, changes made between first and subsequent publication, and some of the evidence of planning found in Dickens' correspondence. Over the last decade the authors of *Dickens at Work* have jointly and separately published studies on their topic, and this book incorporates and adds to those essays.

The avowed object of their study is "the recovery of Dickens as a writer of 'periodical' novels," responding to and conveying " 'the feelings of the day'." The authors undertake joint responsibility for the entire book, but only the chapter on *Dombey and Son* is jointly written. Mrs. Tillotson has contributed essays on the *Sketches, Pickwick, Barnaby Rudge,* and *Little Dorrit;* Professor Butt, on *Copperfield, Bleak House,* and *Hard Times,* as well as a specific and valuable introductory chapter on Dickens' practice and problems in writing for serial publication. "Our emphasis," the preface asserts, ". . . falls upon the process rather than the result, upon Dickens' craft rather than his art."

Various aspects of "process" are considered. The chapter on the *Sketches* considers the revisions made between first and subsequent publications. That on *Pickwick* shows Dickens' discovery, as he wrote and published his first novel, of the possibilities of coherence and over-all planning allowed by the serial form. With *Rudge,* attention is given to the genesis of the book in the five years or more Dickens had it in mind and how he used his sources, and to some of the special difficulties of weekly serialization. The chapters on *Dombey* and *Copperfield* deal with the composition by numbers of those novels (the "Number Plans" for *Copperfield* are transcribed in their entirety); that on *Bleak House* specifies some aspects of its topicality. The essay on *Hard Times* considers Dickens' difficulties and advantages in returning to weekly serialization, and the final chapter on *Dorrit* concentrates on the enlargement of Dickens' conception of this book that led him to give up the title "Nobody's Fault" in favor of *Little Dorrit.*

The essays vary greatly in both freshness and specificity. The chapters on *Dombey* and *Copperfield* are relatively deficient in interest, dealing at unnecessary length with one of the most obvious and incontestable of Dickens' powers – his skill in the manipulation of a complicated plot. More interesting is the actual transcription of the "Number Plans" for *Copperfield,* on which the *Copperfield* chapter is a running comment. The chapter on *Hard Times* loses its focus on weekly

serialization, and becomes a critical précis that raises few questions not raised more fully by F. R. Leavis; and the essay on *Dorrit* is so brief and limited that it scarcely gets started. The contribution of the book, however – and it is substantial – lies in the introductory chapter, and the chapters on the *Sketches*, *Pickwick*, *Rudge*, and *Bleak House*, which augment materially our knowledge of Dickens' working considerations and working methods.

In aggregate, these essays certainly dampen any romantic notions of spontaneous composition. What emerges more fully than ever is the picture of a crafty literary technician, who could accommodate himself, without great violence to his art, to both the limitations of his mass audience and the requirements of serial publication. The extraordinary thing, of course, is that he made his concessions with so little grudge or resentment, that he managed, as few serious writers can, to conduct a "lifelong love-affair with his reading public." Yet when all this has emerged, what has scarcely been suggested is why Dickens was a great novelist, why his writing has permanent interest.

The limitations are largely those of the available evidence to be considered, but the authors have scanted the evidence somewhat, and have been needlessly content with their distinction between craft and art. It is a pity, for example, that the consideration of monthly serialization virtually stops with *Copperfield*, and that nothing is made of the "Number Plans" for *Our Mutual Friend* which, though in the Morgan Library, not the Victoria and Albert, have been readily available in transcript since 1944. (See Ernest Boll, "The Plotting of *Our Mutual Friend*," *MP*, XLII, 1944, 96-122.) Here, in Dickens' last completed novel, is the ultimate in his accommodation to the serial form, an accommodation so habitual that it is scarcely any longer a difficulty, and so nearly entire that the marks of serialization are scarcely discernible to anyone reading the novel in volumes. Here too, there is rather more evidence than in any of the other "Number Plans" of planning going beyond mechanical considerations of plotting to fundamentals of conception and structure. More might profitably have been made too than is made in the chapters on *Rudge* and *Hard Times* of the precise nature of the differences in Dickens' writing for weekly and monthly serialization. For example, *Pickwick*, which is nearly twice the length of *Oliver Twist*, has only four more chapters. Does this involve sparer writing, different construction, or both? Such questions are approached in this book, but insufficiently entered into. Professor Butt and Mrs. Tillotson have perhaps done themselves a disservice, and inhibited the gratitude of their readers, by giving the definitive title *Dickens at Work* to what is in fact an extremely valuable but incomplete consideration.

MONROE ENGEL,
Harvard University

The Bow and the Lyre: The Art of Robert Browning, by ROMA A. KING, JR.; pp. 162. University of Michigan Press: Ann Arbor, Mich., 1957, $4.50.

THIS IS A USEFUL and worthy book. Since Mr. King attempts to confront Browning's poetry directly, to read it with full attention to its subtleties and respect for its intricate structure, he deserves the gratitude of every student of Victorian literature. Through a close study of five representative poems he has arrived at some general conclusions as to the nature of Browning's art. His slim and elegantly produced volume is made up of explications (the author's own word) of "Andrea del Sarto," "Fra Lippo Lippi," "The Bishop Orders his Tomb," "Bishop Blougram's Apology," and "Saul," along with a brief introduction and a concluding chapter on the poet's technique in general.

These particular poems were ostensibly chosen to present two works on the theme of art, two on religion, and one on religion and art. As it turns out, however, the effect is to display four successful dramatic monologues and one unsuccessful one – the egregious "Saul." Mr. King's approach to the task of analyzing Browning's poetry represents what has come in the last ten or fifteen years to be the approved mode for the younger academic critic. He has profited from the insights and the terminology of the New Critics (observe, for example, the constant use of the words "symbol" and "dialectical"). He approaches his eminent Victorian with talismanic references to Pound, Gide, and Ford Madox Ford. He explains at the outset that he

is concerned "to clear away the critical accruement of fifty years, permitting the poems once more to speak for themselves." "The better poems," he suggests, "contain within themselves all the parts essential to their total meaning, making it unnecessary for the critic to go outside the poem for his interpretation." It is possible that the very purity and correctness of these intentions are responsible for the air of thinness which characterizes this study.

Could it be that the virtue of the New Critical method goes out of it when it is domesticated and academicized? This book impels one to a conclusion that other recent literary studies have suggested: that campus-style critical writing might do well to exploit some of its ancient strength, that it may be time to welcome the New Scholarship. For the difficulty of such a work as *The Bow and the Lyre* is that its approach presupposes an esthetic theory (as literary history or straight research do not), and that the author, unable or unwilling to handle complex theoretical issues, leaves us all unsatisfied. It is, for example, not enough to reiterate an intention "to describe and evaluate the poems themselves"; this does not resolve the problem of what a poem of Browning's *is*. It is indisputable that Browning's good poems do not require that we go "outside" them for interpretation on certain levels, but is this any reason to refuse to enrich our readings by all appropriate knowledge of historical background and cultural moment? And is it not one of the functions of the trained critic to decide what is appropriate to the meanings of the poem? To illustrate by only one example, I consider it improper to regard Andrea del Sarto's painting of himself and his wife as outside Browning's poem. We know (fortuitously to be sure) that the poem is a commentary on the painting, and it is quite obvious that the tonalities of the poem (sensitively noted by Mr. King) are closely related to the coloring and peculiar suavity of Andrea's art. A similar objection could be made to Mr. King's discussion of "Fra Lippo Lippi." I would assert that a full experience of that poem must necessarily include an awareness of early Renaissance painting, and of the meaning Browning attached to changes in technique and style. That one might read the explications of both these poems on art without becoming aware that Andrea and Lippo had historical existence argues, I think, a weakness of critical method.

In revolt against a scholarship that has given us ancillary research in place of perceptive reading, and against an enthusiasm that regarded poetry as synonymous with ideas, Mr. King has, I think, gone too far in ignoring the historical bearings of Browning's poems and in refining away their intellectual interest. We are offered some very fine observations on the texture of poetic language and on the central theme of this study, the tension of opposing forces (represented by the bow and the lyre) which unifies the structure of individual poems and characterizes the work in general. But I, at least, looked in vain for any notable illumination. It is curious that the essay on "Saul," an attempt to show that the poem is unsuccessful because it produces neither mystical synthesis nor dramatic tension, is the most impressive section of the book. In the negative critique one is, perhaps, less acutely aware of the absence of that reserve of knowledge, that ample humanism that must enrich the perfect reading of Browning.

I hope that it is not too captious to say that in this book, which will undoubtedly have the good effect of persuading readers to pay close attention to the operation of Browning's poetry, there are some deplorable lapses of style. I shall not cite obvious solecisms but point out that with such a phrase as, "Basically, it is the Bishop, not the poem, that is dichotomized," we are in the presence of a vicious rhetoric. G. Robert Stange,
University of Minnesota

The Organisation of Science in England, by D. S. L. Cardwell; pp. ix + 204. Heinemann: London, 1957, 18s.

This work is a historical survey covering the period 1800-1918, with a brief and inadequate chapter on the 18th century and an equally inadequate glance at developments and problems since 1918. Its scope is very much narrower than the title indicates. It is concerned only with applied science, neglecting the looser but no less real organisation of pure science through societies and other means. Furthermore, the term "organisation" is interpreted in a strictly institutional sense,

so that there is no mention of the less direct forms of organisation that led to Kelvin's work on the problems of Transatlantic telegraphy, or that enabled men like William Nicholson even in the early nineteenth century to earn part of their living as scientific consultants.

Even within this institutional framework, the book is really only concerned with the development of a mechanism for providing professional scientists to occupy regular salaried posts in the laboratories of industrial organisations (private industry or state). The great range of applied science activity organised by the British Association is entirely ignored (except for a casual mention that the Government in 1867 refused to take over its tidal observations), and the Association is only discussed for its opinions on matters of scientific education. Likewise, there is no treatment of the work of the Society of Arts in promoting applied science through the offer of prizes and in similar ways, but only of its role in agitations for educational reforms and in organising examinations. The activities of these bodies (and many others) were a form of organisation of applied science that cannot be ignored without distorting the picture. In fact, Mr. Cardwell gives serious attention only to the development of institutions for technical and scientific education. He has very little to say even about the use to which the products of this education were put in industry or elsewhere, except in so far as this use affected the employment prospects of graduates and therefore the size and scope of educational institutions.

The book appears in the series, "Heinemann Books on Sociology," but it actually contains very little sociological analysis – indeed very little consideration, by any technique, of historical problems of cause and effect. True, there is an interesting discussion of the attitudes of various social classes to the Mechanics' Institutes in the early nineteenth century, but thereafter there is no attempt to classify attitudes by sociological groups. And there is a useful summarising of evidence to show that over-specialisation has been caused by the nature of the examination system rather than by "user demand." But, a few such points apart, the work is in essence little more than a compilation of the opinions of a great many people at various times who urged reforms in the English educational system, together with some statistics about the numbers of teachers, students, and professional scientists at various periods and a few comparisons with Germany and other countries. Quotation and paraphrase of the views of educational reformers occupy by far the greater part of the book.

The outcome is to demonstrate quite clearly, first, that throughout the nineteenth century a great many clear-sighted and eminent men publicly exposed the inadequacy of English scientific education and proposed excellent plans for improving it, and second, that despite these exposures and plans very little was done. These two propositions have long been recognised as true, but Mr. Cardwell documents them in far greater detail than has ever been done before. Yet he makes no serious effort to discover why such clear arguments put forward by so many highly respected men should have led to so little action.

In fact Mr. Cardwell ventures on very few generalisations. And most of these are either platitudinous ("It is not easy, for the casual observer at least, to shake off the suspicion that, by 1900, England had slipped badly in the 'struggle for existence' "), or gross exaggerations ("It would not be claiming too much to suggest that from the day the Yorkshire Union [of Mechanics' Institutes] was founded we can date the beginning of the effective social organisation of science in the country"). His general conclusion would seem to be that England's failure to apply science in industry as it should have been applied was due to inadequacies in education, not to lack of desire on the part of manufacturers to employ scientists. The thesis can hardly be sustained on the evidence offered, since he examines the educational faults in detail, but makes only passing references to the attitudes and actions of manufacturers. Indeed it would seem to be partially contradicted by passages in which he points out that scientific education could not be expanded because there were few employment prospects for scientists except in teaching other scientists. And in any case, his thesis avoids the fundamental question: If manufacturers were prepared to make fuller use of science, why did they not insist on educational reforms?

Thus in the long run the chief value of the

book is as an anthology of nineteenth-century opinions on the state of scientific education and of proposals for reforming it. It is a pity that even this value has been seriously reduced by the frequent omission of references, or by citations so vague that one would sometimes have to thumb through a whole book in order to find the context of a single quotation – the extreme is reached with a reference to "*Hansard*, Parliamentary Debates," leaving the reader to infer from context that the date is probably sometime in 1867 or 1868. The style is extremely tedious – which perhaps partially explains why this reviewer has taken so gloomy a view of the content.

S. Lilley, *University of Nottingham*

The Saint-Simonians, Mill, and Carlyle, by Richard K. P. Pankhurst; pp. x + 154. Sidgwick and Jackson: London, 1957, 21s.

The title of this book is somewhat misleading. Instead of presenting systematically the ideas in the Saint-Simonians' *Expositions* of doctrine and then tracing the relation between those ideas and the thought of Mill and Carlyle, Dr. Pankhurst furnishes an account of the immediate reception given in the early 1830's, by various British individuals and periodicals, to Saint-Simonian missionaries and propaganda. Actually, little attention is given to the books of Mill and Carlyle; although a chapter is devoted to each man, the stress is given to their personal associations with the missionaries and to immediate comments made in letters. Notwithstanding philosophic limitations, this little book gives a detailed and interesting record of the early impact of the Saint-Simonians in the confused England of the Industrial Revolution, with its shifting population, Reform Bill agitation, Trades-unionism, Co-operatives, Utilitarianism, and early efforts at legislation for labor.

In making the book, the author has searched diligently and successfully in not easily accessible materials; and generally he has used them well. Notable are the photographic reproductions of manuscripts in the Saint-Simonian archives at the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal in Paris. He has used fugitive pamphlets and addresses issued by the missionaries, published letters and memoirs of a considerable number of Englishmen interested in the Society, and the files of some thirty British periodicals (the three great quarterlies, such monthlies as *Blackwood's* and *Fraser's* and *The Monthly Repository*, such short-lived and now little-known organs of labor as *The Poor Man's Guardian* and *The Crisis*, and the well-established *Times* and *The Morning Chronicle*). Although the author usually preserves a judicial attitude, the suggestion that either Mill or Carlyle at any time approached discipleship in the Society seems to me uncritical.

As Dr. Pankhurst records, both Mill and Carlyle put special stress on the Saint-Simonian concept of periodicity in history. According to the Saint-Simonians, thus far in Western history two full historical *periods* have waxed and waned, each period having an *organic epoch* and a *critical*, or decadent, *epoch*. The first period, Greek and Roman pagan polytheism, flourished as long as its creeds and institutions remained credible and adequate. As they were eventually undermined and broken-down in a critical epoch, the second historical period, Christian Catholic feudalism, slowly became organized. And gradually, particularly during the critical epoch culminating in the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries, the old Catholic and feudal creeds and institutions became in their turn inadequate, and feudal polity was given its death blow during the French Revolution. From among the ruins, the nineteenth century was to try to evolve the new creeds and institutions adequate to interpret the new discoveries and developments in contemporary and future society: systems that might be as capable of uniting men in purposeful effort as the systems of the two earlier organic epochs had been. The duty of men of ability and good will, therefore, was to point the way to principles by which humanity could eventually realize its best possibilities in the new (or third) historical period. This new period was to be characterized, the Saint-Simonians believed, by *Industrialisme* (socialism) and *Nouveau Christianisme* (the religion of humanity).

Dr. Pankhurst does not relate as clearly as he might this philosophy of history to other aspects of the Saint-Simonian doctrine, but in fact the idea of periodicity does more than anything else to rationalize and bind together the various special aspects of the doctrine: for example, hierarchic organization of society

was designed to offset the anarchic liberalism of the time, international peace and cooperation to replace competition at all levels, and the religion of humanity to supersede older beliefs. A more extensive study of the effect of Saint-Simonian thought on these and other ideas – state-sponsorship of the sciences and of the arts, relief of the poor class, the emancipation of women – in Victorian England would be useful.

One instance must suffice. In Matthew Arnold's mature writing, there are references to the idea of epochs of creative synthesis alternating with epochs of critical inquiry and analysis. He applies this concept of periodicity in three major fields of interest: literature, general culture, and religion. And, alongside the Saint-Simonian philosophy of history, the underlying integrity of Arnold's thought concerning continuity and change in "The Function of Criticism at the Present Time," the essay on Heine, "Obermann Once More," *Culture and Anarchy*, and *Literature and Dogma* gains clarification.

HILL SHINE, *University of Kentucky*

The Evolution of Medical Education in the Nineteenth Century, by CHARLES NEWMAN; pp. x + 340. Oxford University Press: New York, 1957, $4.80; London, 30s.

MEDICAL EDUCATION has usually been viewed as a specialized theme, of interest only to those directly concerned with the preparation of medical men. And Dr. Newman's study is primarily devoted, as would be expected, to professional developments as such. Yet he goes into these with such thoroughness and insight as to reveal, in the process, much about the interrelations between British society and British medicine throughout the nineteenth century.

In this sense, Dr. Newman brings the medical professions into the main stream of British history – more successfully, I think, than has been done by any preceding author. The demand for medical reform is associated with the clamor for reform at large; and the long resistance which ensues reflects a guild consciousness akin to traditional class distinctions. In like manner, opposition to governmental regulation of medicine appears as a particular instance of Victorian laissez-faire; an attitude which Americans can comprehend but which seemed very strange to Continental authorities.

Also encountered in this work are some sidelights on Victorian manners – minor things in themselves but ones which raise interesting questions. Why, in an age of supposed prudery, were professors of anatomy and of obstetrics so fond of the obscene – an inclination which was only overcome by the admission of women to the schools? The author suggests that obscenity amounted to a teaching device; could it also be interpreted as a last (and rather strategic) citadel of eighteenth-century coarseness, or, perhaps, as a reaction from the other contemporary extreme of genteel propriety?

The actual history of medical education is gone into with great thoroughness. The British program at the outset of the century was complex and uncoordinated. Universities and guild colleges all had a hand in educating and licensing practitioners, and England, Scotland, and Ireland each had its own set of these institutions. Physicians, surgeons, and apothecaries were jealous of their respective prerogatives, and matters were further complicated by the chemists and quacks who flourished in great numbers.

After decades of agitation, Parliament made a first step towards regulation in the Medical Act of 1858, which provided a national Registry and a Medical Council with limited powers for supervising education and licensing. Even before this, however, the London hospital schools had done much to improve educational procedures – first under the influence of French medical science, and later under that of the Germans. Although no single "port of entry" to medical education and no one licensing authority were provided, the guilds coordinated their activities and the "safe general practitioner" began to emerge by the 1870's.

The author's detailed treatment of some themes, such as that of parliamentary proposals, threatens at times to lose the forest in the trees. But in other connections, as in describing examinations, the details provide realism which makes for understanding. Dr. Newman does not hesitate to express his own opinions, which lend some pungency to the narrative but which the reader is, of course, free to reject.

Despite its title, the study relates chiefly

to Great Britain and Ireland; so that there is little opportunity to view developments against a larger background. What one has here, therefore, is interpretation from within, possessing all the advantages of intimacy but lacking much in the way of comparative generalizations. International comparisons, however, were beyond the purpose of this enlightening work.

RICHARD H. SHRYOCK,
The Johns Hopkins University

George Birkbeck: Pioneer of Adult Education, by THOMAS KELLY; pp. 380. Liverpool University Press: Liverpool, 1957, 45s.
Pioneers of Popular Education, 1760-1850, by H. M. POLLARD; pp. xiii + 297. John Murray: London, 1956, 28s.; Transatlantic Arts: Hollywood-by-the-Sea, Fla., 1957, $6.75.

THESE TWO BOOKS are complementary. Birkbeck emerges from a native scientific matrix as a bridger of the gulf that (in the metaphor of the *Mechanic's Oracle* in 1825) "separated the operative classes from the regions of science." The constellation of educationalists in Dr. H. M. Pollard's gallery appear as British reflectors (or refractors) of Continental suns. Birkbeck is primarily a "pioneer" in adult education; Pollard's group are "pioneers" in the education of children. The chief difference between the two books is the stance of their authors. Mr. Thomas Kelly, dealing with a doctor, considers the turbulent world of science; Pollard, dealing with (amongst others) enthusiasts like Joseph Lancaster and Lady Noel Byron, is anchored in a literary world. Kelly quantifies, Pollard qualifies. One corrects the other.

Two cases must suffice. The first is Leonard Horner, the first warden of London University. To Pollard, Horner was "peculiarly fitted" to convince the people of England that "the only satisfactory means of ensuring educational progress was to establish a state system of schools." But to Kelly, Horner was "overbearing," and only his removal in 1831 opened up a way for the reform of the University of London. The second case is their estimate of the efficacy of popular education at this time. Pollard refers to "the slough of intellectual inertia," presumably using this phrase to describe the schools (for it certainly cannot characterise the age of Davy, Faraday and Bentham). But Kelly attempts, with the help of the work of Dr. R. K. Webb, to provide a more sober qualitative judgement on the basis of quantifiable evidence and concludes, "the butter of education was certainly spread very thin, but was more widely spread than the Committee (on the Education of the Working Classes, 1838) supposed."

Each author has written two books in one. Kelly, in addition to giving us what is the definitive life of Birkbeck, has added a magnificent statistical analysis and bibliography of the Mechanics' Institute movement. Pollard, more synoptic and philosophic in approach, has provided a survey of the Nature School in Switzerland, the Netherlands, Prussia, and France, and then gives us an account of the growth of these ideas (and their protagonists) in England.

It is impossible to fault Kelly, for his work bears the evidence of half a lifetime's devoted study and should be an essential item in the library of every scholar. Pollard has, on the other hand, aimed at revaluing the work of earlier educational historians and, in correcting them, has not been free from bias in assembling his "pioneers." Why, for instance, has he included Lady Noel Byron and omitted E. T. Craig, Thomas Wright Hill or the elusive Fontana and Prati? Craig went on to become a friend of William Morris, Hill's children and pupils to play an important part in Victorian England, while Fontana and Prati (and the creed they represented) were said by John Stuart Mill in the *Examiner* to have taught to think a larger proportion of the most promising youths of the instructed classes than he had done.

Kelly ranged far and wide for new letters and papers on his subject, and, in over eighty pages of appendices, shows the variety of information they contain. Particularly is this so of Appendix VI – a list of mechanics' institutes, literary and scientific institutions, and similar bodies. His bibliography is meticulous. Pollard has mainly relied on the private papers of Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth, and much of the earlier part of his story is taken from foreign dictionaries of education and other secondary authorities.

W. H. G. ARMYTAGE,
University of Sheffield

The Stones of Manchester, by CECIL STEWART; pp. 144. Edward Arnold: London, 1956, 40s.; St. Martin's Press: New York, 1957, $8.50.

The Architecture of Victorian Sydney, by MORTON HERMAN, assisted by Boyd Atkinson; pp. 192. Angus and Robertson: Sydney and London, 1957, 75s.

MR. STEWART on the opening page of his impressive study of Manchester architecture quotes a comment on the city's growth from the *Building News* of 1861: "There has been nothing to equal it since the building of Venice." Such was the considered view of a serious organ of architectural opinion, and, fantastic as it appears under a longer scrutiny, it is worth considering how it could be pronounced. This is the main object of Mr. Stewart's book. It is copiously illustrated with contemporary drawings from Austin's *Lancashire Illustrated, The Builder,* and *The Illustrated London News,* and there are frequent extracts from contemporary accounts. We are taken behind the common covering of soot, which masks so much of the architectural variety of the great industrial towns, by a sympathetic guide, ready to make his own aesthetic judgments, at times quite sweepingly, but well aware that architecture of all the arts is one that requires some understanding of its historical setting and the consequent purposes for which it was built.

The most significant figure in the building of nineteenth-century Manchester was Edward Walters. Thomas Harrison, Francis Goodwin, Robert Smirke and Charles Barry had all produced for Manchester classical designs, some of them, particularly that of Barry's Royal Institution, of considerable merit; but there was none of the planned development that gave Newcastle such a unified distinction. Manchester's classical buildings remained detached units against a background of sordid slums, and it was not till Walters employed the style of the Italian palazzo for the great warehouses of the mid-century that Manchester found an architectural idiom which gave a particular character to the city and which became an example eagerly followed elsewhere. Considerations of prestige no doubt underlay its use, and there is a bitter quality about the grandeur of storage when housing remained hopelessly inadequate, but architecturally it transformed the central streets into dignified and splendid thoroughfares. Walter's Free Trade Hall (1853-56) was more elaborate than any warehouse, but it is in the same style; it marks the climax of the Italianate dominance in Manchester. When, nine years later, building was commenced around the new Albert Square, Thomas Worthington's Albert Memorial was a Gothic shrine, a precursor of Scott's in South Kensington, and his Memorial Hall was in Venetian Gothic. Then in 1868 building was begun on the new Town Hall to the designs of Alfred Waterhouse. This extraordinary building, then as now of a uniform black texture, is Gothic used with confidence and certainty, but with a strong period accent. Its harsh external angularity will probably always seem too emphatic, but its internal vistas and its great hall are admirably and imaginatively planned.

There is much else to be noted in Mr. Stewart's book, both secular and ecclesiastical. He has an enthusiast's knowledge of his subject, but uses it with a balanced judgment and expresses it in a lucid and readable style. Apart from a confusion between R. H. and R. C. Carpenter, the standard of accuracy throughout seems high.

Victorian Sydney had the same rapid growth as Manchester, and, despite differing climatic conditions, much of its building had stylistic similarities. English fashions and practices, often with very little adaptation, were everywhere apparent. Edmund Blacket's design for Mort and Company's Wool Store (1864) is in the palazzo manner of Edward Walters, and Blacket holds in Sydney much the same place as that of Walters in Manchester. Unfortunately Sydney has found less skilful chroniclers.

The plates, taken by the authors, are as admirable as they are numerous, and they constitute an extremely important documentation in several cases of buildings since demolished or under present threat of demolition. But the book is arranged chronologically in decades, starting in 1850 and running to 1901, and this has resulted in too catalogic a treatment. There is a vast amount of information, but, if the questions that spring to mind were to have been answered, lengthier pauses were needed for a survey of the material. In particular the leading archi-

tects emerge much less clearly than in Mr. Morton Herman's earlier book, dealing with the period 1788 to 1845. Edmund Blacket came to Sydney in 1845 and by 1848 had built two churches there. He is said to have had no previous training, except from his hobby of sketching churches, but this seems hardly credible, for from the first his buildings are thoroughly professional. By 1854 he was at work on the university buildings, where his great hall is one of the most striking interiors of the Gothic Revival. In the east front he produced a splendidly organised and restrained design, that can hold its own with any contemporary work in England. We need to know much more of him, his English contacts, and his Australian development, than is to be learned in this volume.

William Wardell, Pugin's pupil, was a more individual artist, and probably the greatest architect of nineteenth-century Australia. Much of his work is in Melbourne, but St. Mary's Roman Catholic Cathedral in Sydney is a distinguished building, with the spatial sense that is so well shown in St. Patrick's at Melbourne, and the New South Wales and the Union Clubs, built by Wardell in the eighties, have an assured dignity and simplicity of statement, surprisingly at variance with the lavish Sydney buildings of the great boom period.

This volume will inevitably become a handbook of Australian architectural history, but it is the groundwork only, and the implications of much in it remain to be further explored. The absence of an index considerably diminishes its value. It has been handled too much as a picture book and not enough as a contribution to history, which in fact it is.

T. S. R. Boase,
Magdalen College, Oxford

Pioneer of Sociology: The Life and Letters of Patrick Geddes, by Philippe Mairet; pp. xx + 226. Lund Humphries: London, 1957, 21s.; Clarke, Irwin: Toronto, 1957, $5.00.

Sir Patrick Geddes was a practical dreamer who made scaffolding for later workers to use in trying to build more permanently; though they too often forget, what Geddes so deeply felt, that change, evolution if one likes to use the term, is the one constant feature of life and the universe. Geddes was a pupil of Huxley, the apostle of the unity of nature as revealed in the process of change; and he was deeply moved to try to study that process in social life, where study might be at one and the same time both objective and curative. To combine these last two qualities was Geddes' supreme aim, a high and difficult one that roused much criticism, because he sometimes was apt to carry prophetic vision into practical effect with inadequate adjustment of detail. Yet Sir William Holford, the famous town planner, aptly says in his foreword to this book: "Wherever I go in my mind, I meet Geddes coming back."

Pioneer of town planning, of residential universities outside Oxford and Cambridge, of regional surveys both as an educational method and as a guide to social policy, of summer schools as refreshers for professional workers and also as conferences for free discussion, of the cleansing of Edinburgh's Royal Mile, of serious study for social betterment in India, Geddes was ever on the move in thought and effort, and this book pictures him as his old friends knew him. He was deeply moved by Ruskin's drastic criticism of Victorian liberal capitalism, as well as by Auguste Comte's brave, if not very successful, efforts to build a religion and a ritual on a humanist basis. To combine these visions with Huxley's teaching, even in a measure, was one of Geddes' great achievements.

Eye trouble early in life involved for him limitation of microscope work and of minute observation in biology, and this led him to express his thought by folding paper into squares tracing sequences based on Frederic le Play's triad, "*Lieu, Travail, Famille*"; Geddes made a clear advance in his version "Place, Work, Folk." Geddes saw more clearly than almost any man of his time that the human person is essentially a social animal. Truth, beauty, and love, he felt, were products of Emergent Evolution in social life, products it was a privilege to cherish. This led him to practical efforts to build on the past rather than to make a *tabula rasa* and start afresh. So he tried to cleanse Edinburgh's Royal Mile instead of destroying it and making a new beginning; and he moved and rebuilt in More's garden, Chelsea, the fine old Crosby Hall that could no longer remain in London's city-centre. It led him, similarly, to plan for a better Indore still in

harmony with what he considered the better features of Indian social tradition, rather than to build large and incongruous "Western" additions to Indian cities. Sometimes he was carried beyond practicality by his dreams, but they were dreams of an idealist working for a better social life, nationally and internationally.

One remembers his clear objectivity in foreseeing the troubles that were arising through English neglect of Ireland, and his prophecy of the coming of the war of 1914-18 and its immense consequences in the transference, after a while, of the heavy responsibilities of world power from Britain to the United States. It was not that he was born before his time, but rather that he developed an outlook to the future that never forgot the past. Hebridean folk songs and traditions, pageants of the story of Edinburgh, and many other efforts consumed his energies and, too often, his slender resources. His *extempore* lectures both inspired and perplexed his audiences, and his writings, vigorous and suggestive, would have been clearer had Thomas Carlyle had less influence over his youthful mind. But he avoided Carlyle's idolatry of the hero, which presaged fascism, just as he avoided the idolatry of the State which presaged Bolshevism.

These qualities of mind and character insure that Geddes will not be forgotten. Edinburgh University, which had rejected him, celebrated the centenary of his birth; his Outlook Tower near the head of the Royal Mile has been developed and is very active; a bequest has just been made to support regional surveys on his lines; and his thought is used with critical devotion by Lewis Mumford in his own studies of human evolution. Mr. Mairet's book, the third published biography and the best so far, is both a contribution to and a confirmation of this interest in Geddes.

H. J. Fleure,
University College, London

Victorian Ballet Girl, The Tragic Story of Clara Webster, by Ivor Guest; pp. viii + 136. A. and C. Black: London, 1957, 21s.

In spite of employing many literary "ghosts," Alexandre Dumas *père* never achieved his intention of covering the whole history of his country in romances. Mr. Guest, however, working entirely alone in his vacations from a busy life as a London solicitor, bids fair to fulfil his wish to record the whole history of ballet. This is his fifth book on the subject and yet his entire period, so far, has been from 1780 (the beginning of "The Romantic Ballet in England") to 1870 (the second volume of "The Ballet of the Second Empire").

In *Victorian Ballet Girl* he has confined himself to a single dancer, the English Clara Webster, who was born at Bath in 1821. She was not a great dancer of the order of Taglioni or Cerrito, but she might well have become one, for in 1844, the year of her death, she was a minor soloist at Drury Lane, and the *Times* and the *Morning Herald* were saying, "She proves how near the English dancers are approaching the excellence of their foreign rivals" and "Miss Webster is perhaps the only English *danseuse* who has attained that firmness, freedom and confidence which distinguish artistes of the Continent."

It was, of course, her death that has made her so famous. She was burned alive on the stage at Drury Lane (during a performance

of "The Revolt of the Harem") and died three days later. One might wonder how this single tragic incident in the short life of a dancer who could not even be called a "star" could provide material for a delightful, yet serious, book of 136 pages (and thirty-one illustrations) – but that is the special character of Mr. Guest's artistry. This book uses the sad story of Clara Webster as a peg on which the author lightly hangs all the discoveries which he has made in his researches. The result is the best evocation of the Victorian period of ballet in England which we are ever likely to be given.

Although Queen Victoria appears to have enjoyed ballet, the profession of a ballet-girl in London would certainly not have been called a respectable one – not so much because of the connexion with vice (as on the Continent), but because of its "shameless display" of so-called nudity on the stage. The Countess of Blessington's poem sums up the situation: "Brisk music gayer scenes announces, / And in a half-dressed *danseuse* bounces." And Chalon's illustration of the "half-dressed *danseuse*" shows her to be wearing the familiar (and to our eyes, discreet) costume of a Sylphide, yet he leaves us in no doubt as to the reactions aroused in the innocent young girl who is watching from a box:

When Mary saw her vault in air,
Her snow-white tunic leaving bare
Her limbs. . . .

Surprised and shocked she turned away,
Wondering how women e'er could stay . . .

The true picture of the hard-working and under-paid Victorian ballet-girl's life was given in 1847 by Albert Smith in his delightful "The Natural History of the Ballet-Girl" (a description which is as true of the ballet-girl of today as it was then), and Mr. Guest quotes fully from this and comments on it, besides using the charming little wood-cuts from it for his chapter-openings. Side issues such as this, together with a grim opening chapter ("The Holocaust of Ballet Girls") describing many fatalities among dancers whose dresses had caught fire on the stage, and the gossip and the descriptions of ballets, have been most skilfully woven together to form a perfect picture of this tiny, yet romantic, feature of the Victorian scene. There is even a romantic interest. Clara Webster had a lover in a Lieutenant Michael Bruce of the Grenadier Guards, with whom she lived and may even have married. This episode in her life is not allowed to interfere with the general picture of Victorian ballet but is discreetly confined to a single chapter at the end of the book – and provides some of the best reading of the volume, for Mr. Guest's literary style is least happy when he is dutifully and laboriously describing a ballet, but becomes much more free and readable when he is allowing his imagination to roam a little. Much credit is due to the publishers, Messrs. A. and C. Black, who have given to this book something of the air of a modern "Keepsake" by their careful treatment of its layout and decorative quality.

G. B. L. Wilson,
Science Museum, London

Baden-Powell, by E. E. Reynolds; pp. viii + 270. 2nd edition. Oxford University Press: New York, 1957, $2.90.
Twenty-Seven Years with Baden-Powell, by E. K. Wade; pp. 160. Blanford Press: London, 1957, 13s. 6d.; Copp: Toronto, 1957, $2.75.
Baden-Powell at Mafeking, by Duncan Grinnell-Milne; pp. 144. Edward Arnold: London, 1957, 25s.

It was with some surprise that I found no mention whatever of Baden-Powell, or his Boy Scout movement, in the two books to which I turned immediately after reading the last of these volumes on this remarkable man, the centenary of whose birth was commemorated last year. Holbrook Jackson's *The Eighteen-Nineties* is silent on Baden-Powell, as is Karl Mannheim's "Youth in Modern Society" in his *Diagnosis of Our Time*. The former omission is the less surprising, because although B-P had surely staked some claim to recognition as a personality, if not a great writer, through his adventures in India and Africa and his six books published in the 1880's and 1890's, Jackson believed that the "orgy of Mafeking night" brought to an end the spirit of the praiseworthy nineties by unleashing new and undesirable Imperialistic and militaristic forces among Britons. Mannheim's neglect even to criticise Baden-Powell and his Boy Scouts is more difficult to under-

stand, especially since his Oxford address on Youth, and his plea for a "nation-wide Youth movement," was delivered in 1941, very soon after Baden-Powell's death, at a time when tributes to and appraisals of the Chief Scout were coming in from all quarters. I have not checked whether Mannheim did in fact view the Boy Scouts and Girl Guides as unduly regimented and jingoist organisations, but such, certainly, was the opinion of many in Britain throughout Baden-Powell's life. To what extent was this opinion, so prominent among pacifists, liberals and socialists, justified? That would seem to be a central question for any reviewer of these centenary volumes.

For answer, or at least substantial part of the answer, I think it legitimate to look to the evidence supplied by the principal biographer, E. E. Reynolds, whose revised *Baden-Powell* is the major work among these three books, and also to the intimate observations of Mrs. E. K. Wade, who was for so many years Baden-Powell's confidential secretary. The picture one gains from these writings is that the first World War marked a watershed in B-P's thought. Before he resigned from the army in 1910, soldiering in India and military scouting on the frontiers of Colonial Africa had strongly influenced his outlook and behavior. But the tragedy of a great world conflict led to a deep and, I have no doubt, sincere determination to work at full pressure for international understanding among the youth of Europe, the United States, and the wider world. He began to travel tirelessly in his endeavors to overcome obstacles of race, nation, and creed, and at the first Jamboree, at Olympia, London, in 1920, he challenged contingents from twenty-five nations to "exercise mutual forbearance and give and take" rather than to permit one nation to seek to "impose its particular will." The "Jingoist" charge, therefore, would seem to have little or no foundation.

As to the charge of militarism, it is perhaps unfortunate that from the very nature of their circumstances the first Boy Scouts of Mafeking should have impressed themselves upon the public consciousness more as young soldiers than as apprentice citizens. For as early as the First War Baden-Powell, who was later to condemn Fascist youth movements, made clear his strong preference for Scout as opposed to Cadet training. In his words: "Cadet training imposes collective instruction upon boys from without; while Scouting encourages self-development on the part of the individual from within." It is important in this connection to stress that the "uniform" of the Boy Scouts was introduced to iron out class and wealth differences in dress and to emphasize brotherhood, based upon a common allegiance to certain carefully selected and, I believe, admirable personal and social ideals. In other ways too Baden-Powell could hardly have taken greater pains to obliterate "militarist" tendencies within the movement. Thus, the second charge would also seem to have little foundation.

That Baden-Powell was a Great Victorian, as well as a great twentieth-century figure, is beyond question, and between them these centenary books do succeed in bringing out his many-sided character and all-round achievement. They are eulogistic, which is not surprising for centenary works, but they have their real interest and value. Mr. Reynolds' study is the most thorough and comprehensive, though it is a competent rather than an inspired piece of writing, which possibly suffers from undue compression; while Mrs. Wade's book is perhaps too studiously "secretarial" to commend itself as a piece of literature. Her selection of illustrative material is, however, very sound, and many of her observations are very much to the point. Duncan Grinnell-Milne's *Baden-Powell at Mafeking* is perhaps the most enjoyable of the books, since he succeeds in re-creating the atmosphere of this critical period of Baden-Powell's life. Encounters between the besieged British and the besieging Boers are dealt with in lively style and, while Mr. Grinnell-Milne's sympathies are sometimes too one-sided for modern comfort, he does offer an accurate account of a military episode which has suffered too much from propagandist publicity. Certainly the reader of this work is left with a proper appreciation of the real significance of Baden-Powell's enterprise and leadership at Mafeking where thousands of Burghers were tied up for seven critical months during the second Anglo-Boer War, just as in the Reynolds' study one is given an adequate reminder of B-P's subsequent organisation of the South African Constabulary which played so notable a part in the post-

war reconstruction work of Lord Milner.

All these books deserve to be read. Those with an open mind on the merits of Scouting and Guiding will gain new insights, and confirmed critics may well find that they must, in fairness, revise certain traditional ideas.

KENNETH KIRKWOOD,
St. Antony's College, Oxford

Onward Christian Soldier: A Life of Sabine Baring-Gould — Parson, Squire, Novelist, Antiquary (1834-1924), by WILLIAM PURCELL, introduction by John Betjeman; pp. xi + 188. Longmans: London, 1957, 21s.; Toronto, $3.25.

SENATOR VANDENBERG wrote after the death of the Rev. Peter Marshall that to him Dr. Marshall "was the embodiment of 'Onward, Christian Soldiers'." Mr. Purcell implies by the title of this biography that the Rev. Sabine Baring-Gould, the author of the words of "Onward, Christian Soldiers," was himself the embodiment of the hymn. Yet Purcell must have been aware of the considerable inappropriateness of his title, for he states flatly of Baring-Gould: "With greater cares laid upon him, perhaps with the deanery for which he was so perfectly fitted, he might well have wandered less in his own private fields. But that he would have served the cause of Christ and His Church more amply and lastingly, had he been given the chance, is very probable." And elsewhere he says that Baring-Gould "wrote far too much far too quickly."

Baring-Gould was a great man, however, on several counts. Purcell succeeds delightfully, with a rapid and easy style, in making a valuable record of a notable Victorian and his environment. This is not a bulky biography that strives to be definitive: Purcell states at the outset that the book will have omissions. But it gives "some sort of picture of a very remarkable and interesting man." The book inspires admiration for the gusto, the great energy, the strong piety, and the hard-working and many-sided amateurishness of Baring-Gould. The word "amateur" was to him a term of praise (as Betjeman shrewdly remarks). His vast and kindly energy was directed into various fields, and though he seems largely to have enjoyed himself, he seldom spared himself from long hours of labor, physical and mental. He worked as schoolteacher and as clergyman among slum-people, mill-workers, and rough sailor-folk and farmers. In the fifties, sixties, and seventies he was in his way a crusader for the Oxford Movement, working with all sorts and conditions of people. Purcell's account of what the Oxford Movement, in the years after Newman had become a Roman Catholic, meant to the Church of England, and of course to Baring-Gould, would alone make this book valuable.

Baring-Gould did more than labor as social worker and pastor. His family background and standing as a gentleman did not keep him from tremendous activity. His most famous hymns, "Onward, Christian Soldiers" and "Now the Day Is Over," are a minute part of his writing. His literary output was huge and long-continuing: about thirty novels (J. M. Barrie in 1890 wrote, "Of our eight or ten living novelists who are popular by merit, few have greater ability than Mr. Baring-Gould"); numerous bulky works in the field of folklore, and in the theology and the saints' lives of the Middle Ages; various travel books and histories and biographies; more than twenty volumes of sermons written primarily for country folk; two volumes of autobiography; works on archaeology; works on theology generally; and a great collection, made laboriously at first hand, of 202 songs and ballads with words and music taken down from odd old persons in the West of England. "It is indeed incredible, this enormous, un-coordinated output." Yet Purcell manages to make it somehow credible, and also admirable, as coming from a genius, a dedicated Christian, and a great man who was "among the last of the parson writers of the literary rather than of the theological kind."

Purcell has selected well and has written an exciting and sympathetic account of a remarkable man whose life story, however sketchily presented, will give almost every present-day reader a bigger and better concept of Victorian England than he has gained hitherto. Purcell is regrettably unfair when he speaks of Matthew Arnold as one who had lost his faith and was "given to wandering around"; but this is a small detail. Here is a book of great interest and value for the gen-

eral student of the Victorian period in England. WILLIAM D. TEMPLEMAN, *University of Southern California*

A History of Punch, by R. G. G. PRICE; pp. 384. Collins: London, 1957, 30s.

REVIEWING SPIELMANN'S MASSIVE *History of Punch* in 1895, a writer in *Blackwood's* regretted that the veil of anonymity should be even partially withdrawn from the editors and staff of *Punch*, or indeed from journalism in general. "We are not at all sure," he remarked (in an unsigned article), "that the abandonment of the old-fashioned reticence and the sacrifice of the old-fashioned privacy are in the long-run good for the writers themselves, for the public, or for the press as a whole." He was fighting a losing battle. Anonymity in journalism was on its way out, and the long and involved process of retrospective identification had already begun. In the same year Copinger's pioneering work, *The Authorship of the First Hundred Numbers of the Edinburgh Review*, was one of the first of a series of studies by historians, antiquarians, and bibliographers in the fertile field of the nineteenth-century periodical. Mr. Price's book, of which more than half is devoted to the Victorian years of *Punch*, is a lively contribution to the series, and can be recommended as an introduction to an important phase of what he well calls "a rather specialised kind of journalism."

This is in no sense an official or authorized history of *Punch*, though Mr. Price has made some use of the records of Bradbury, Agnew and Company. He gives us little new information on authorship or on editorial policy and practice, and this is disappointing; for if we except Thackeray and Jerrold, none of the writers who helped to make *Punch* what it was – the Mayhews, the à Becketts, Brooks, Taylor, Burnand, and Anstey, to name only a few – can be identified completely and with certainty from published sources. He does quote at some length from the diary of Henry Silver (which ought to be published in its entirety as a document equal in interest to Hardman's diary, though more limited in scope). He also supplies a useful bibliography, and explains as well as is now possible the controversial question of the birth of *Punch*, which has provoked so many competing claims. An appendix by Kenneth Bird ("Fougasse") on the methods of reproducing and printing the drawings in *Punch* is a straightforward account of wood engraving and its effect on the techniques of the *Punch* artists, and of the changes which followed the introduction of the process block and half-tone in the nineties. For all this we are grateful; if there is little that is new to scholars, we must accept Mr. Price's stated purpose of giving us a sketch rather than a formal history.

The story of *Punch* in the Victorian age is largely the story of two long editorships, those of Mark Lemon (1841-70) and Francis Burnand (1880-1906), with the relatively brief terms of Shirley Brooks (1870-74) and Tom Taylor (1874-80) forming a kind of interregnum. Of these the *Punch* of Mark Lemon – of Jerrold, Thackeray, Leech, and Doyle – is unquestionably the most interesting. It is also the best known. Mr. Price is therefore to be commended not so much for retelling the familiar tale of *Punch's* shift from radicalism to respectability during its first thirty years, as for his enlightening comments on the work of the new recruits brought in by Lemon who were to give the later Victorian *Punch* its character: Brooks, Burnand, Keene, Du Maurier, and Sambourne, as well as Tenniel, the sturdiest veteran of them all (1850-1901). The chapter on Burnand's editorship, for example, explains how Tenniel's influence, extending well into the twentieth century, kept *Punch* out of the tradition of English caricature; here is a clue to the curious anomaly which prevented the work of the two greatest caricaturists of the period, Pellegrini and Beerbohm, from appearing in the magazine.

Mr. Price's treatment of the twentieth-century years of *Punch*, under Owen Seaman (1906-32) and E. V. Knox (1932-49), brings his chronicle down to the recent editorships of Kenneth Bird and Malcolm Muggeridge and to new problems of adaptation and survival in the Atomic Age.

The book is generously illustrated. It will not supersede Spielmann, but it will form a valuable supplement. It is written, moreover, in a lively rapid-fire prose as different as possible from the ponderous, coy, cliché-ridden style of Spielmann's period piece.

OSCAR MAURER, *University of Texas*

Hans Andersen and Charles Dickens, by ELIAS BREDSDORFF; pp. 140. W. Heffer: Cambridge, 1956, 25s.

I SHALL ADMIT that my opening remarks in this review represent a certain form of sentimental carping. But in the title of this book why is Andersen's name, which is invariably written "Hans Christian Andersen" in English-speaking countries, and "H. C. Andersen" in Denmark, given in the curtal form of "Hans Andersen"? Hans Christian Andersen (or H. C. Andersen) belongs to a distinguished company of writers who are consistently denominated by a tripartite name, whether the two Christian names, or merely the initials, are used along with the surname, and it seems most strange that his usual cognomen should be truncated in the title of a book of which the name itself is a part.

Even so, very few scholarly books are entitled as excitingly as this one: *Hans Andersen and Charles Dickens*. To Victorian scholars who are especially interested in Anglo-foreign literary relations, a book blessed with such a title piques the curiosity in no small degree, for the record of the literary association or of the mere friendship of two of the most widely read authors in all literary history, representing as they do two cultures, promises much. Such a record may illuminate dark corners of both Danish and English biography, or it may lend a measure of support to the Anglo-foreign scholar's conviction that the ridiculous and exaggerated notions which sometimes obtain concerning the essentially insular attitudes of the major Victorian authors are thoroughly false. Unfortunately, the excitement which the title elicits is unsatisfied. This is, indeed, a most disappointing book; disappointing chiefly because it shows only too clearly that there were no significant relations between Andersen and Dickens, personal, literary, or otherwise; disappointing, also, not so much for what it is as for what it is not.

It should promptly be noted, however, that the learned Lecturer in Danish at Cambridge, whose scholarship is impeccable, is at fault only insofar as he has valued the letters exchanged between Andersen and Dickens (and other associated items) somewhat beyond their intrinsic worth. Nevertheless, Dr. Bredsdorff's book does tell a pathetic story. It is the tale of Andersen's unrepaid adulation of Dickens, a narrative of misunderstandings, misconceptions, and mishaps, most of them attributable, no doubt, to Andersen's monumental eccentricity and to Dickens' calculated coldness.

Given such disparate personalities, it appears to have been categorically and forever impossible that Dickens and Andersen should ever have reached any real kind of rapport. Dickens was indifferent to, or incapable of, returning Andersen's admiration and affection; and Andersen seems to have had no understanding whatever of the thoroughly unpleasant conditions which he created in the Dickens household. When he came over from Denmark to visit his English idol, he far overstayed his welcome. His chastisement followed in due course. Andersen commented upon it, somewhat fondly, after Dickens' death, in a melancholy diary entry, June 11, 1870: "I shall not have any explanation from him as to why he did not answer my later letters."

Andersen's pursuit of Dickens was wholly quixotic and Dickens' rejection of the Dane was completely thoughtless, if not downright arrogant. Such conflict, however, does not in itself provide the scholar with much very important material with which to make a major contribution to literary biography. Dr. Bredsdorff has recognized this fact in his preface. "The connexion between Andersen and Dickens," he writes, "is, I admit, a minor affair." In this one sentence, I feel, he has made a proper evaluation of both the substance and the usefulness of his book. It is a very minor footnote to the lives of two very major nineteenth-century writers.

KARL LITZENBERG,
University of Michigan

The Man Has Wings: New Poems and Plays, by FRANCIS THOMPSON, edited by Terence L. Connolly, S. J.; pp. 153. Doubleday: Garden City, New York, 1957, $3.50.

FRANCIS THOMPSON, probably the most complete exponent of a Catholic Renaissance which is still flourishing, was in his productive years too ill to copy, organize, and evaluate his varied output. This service, however, is being rendered by an increasingly large

number of scholars, chief of whom is Father Connolly. To his excellent editions of Thompson's *Poems*, his *Literary Criticisms*, and *Minor Poets*, he now adds seventy-four poems not previously released for publication. Included in the volume are two experimental pieces in dramatic form, "Napoleon Judges" and "Man Proposes but Woman Disposes," the latter in a delightful comedy-of-manners style which reveals a little-known aspect of Thompson's wit.

This collection, exhumed from the fragile pages of the yellowing notebooks recently acquired by the Thompson Museum at Boston College, is an important contribution to a full understanding of Francis Thompson, the whole man. Most people know him only for his fine ode, "The Hound of Heaven," which has been very widely translated, and performed in musical settings at the Royal Albert Hall, the Edinburgh Music Festival, and elsewhere. *The Man Has Wings* is no anticlimax to the known works of Thompson. Indeed, except for the high quality of the previous collections, one would be inclined to say that Father Connolly had saved the best wine for the last, for here is the authentic youthful genius, untouched by the various literary influences apparent in Thompson's later poetry.

The title aptly suggests the dual physical-spiritual nature of man which the poems explore. Although he was not an ascetic, Thompson regards man's tragedy as the missing of the essential spirituality, the "many-splendoured thing." Of the sonnets, "Sad Semele" is perhaps the most provocative in its characteristic fusion of classical and contemporary themes. The translation of Horace's "Lyce" doubtless deserves the editor's high regard, but it lacks the subjective fire of such typically Thompsonian things as *De Mortuis*, in which he reiterates the old truth that out of suffering come the sweetest songs.

It is regrettable that Thompson's precise translations from Old French and Middle English have once more been overlooked. While the leaves of the notebooks may still be turned with match-sticks, these additional verses should be rescued from oblivion. They would re-emphasize the catholicity of his work, which has already been the subject of innumerable studies from Norway to Jamaica and Tel Aviv to Tokyo.

MYRTLE PIHLMAN POPE,
Atlanta, Georgia

Announcing the second volume of GORDON N. RAY'S masterful two-volume biography

Thackeray

THE AGE OF WISDOM

1847-1863

USING material never before available to a biographer, Professor Ray has written what may well be regarded as the definitive study of Thackeray. This second volume covers the novelist's fullest and most productive years, from 1847 when *Vanity Fair* was published, until his death in 1863. "No scholar is better equipped to tell this story than Mr. Ray . . . He has a detailed and accurate knowledge of Thackeray's life and personality and of nineteenth-century England. He has the imaginative grasp, too without which facts are dead bones."* The first volume of this biography, THE USES OF ADVERSITY: 1811-1846, was highly praised by critics everywhere and established Gordon Ray as "the greatest living authority on the life and works of Thackeray."**

Other books by Professor Ray include THE LETTERS AND PRIVATE PAPERS OF WILLIAM MAKEPEACE THACKERAY in four volumes, and THE BURIED LIFE: A Study of the Relation between Thackeray's Fiction and His Experience.

*N. Y. Times Book Review **Newark News

Now at your bookstore, $8.00

McGRAW-HILL

AVAILABLE THIS MONTH . . .

PROSE
OF THE
VICTORIAN
PERIOD

edited by
WILLIAM E. BUCKLER
New York University

The aim of this anthology is to provide the students with the largest possible selection of important nonfiction Victorian prose in an attractive and readable format at a low price. Developed from the author's classroom experience, PROSE OF THE VICTORIAN PERIOD offers generous selections from the writings of Macaulay, Carlyle, Newman, Mill, Ruskin, Arnold, Huxley, and Pater. A critical introduction precedes these selections.

Available as a paperbound RIVERSIDE EDITION or clothbound.

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY

ISIS

The Foremost International Journal Devoted to the History of Science and Its Cultural Applications

ISIS, the official journal of the History of Science Society, was founded by George Sarton in 1912. Besides encouraging active interest in the history of science in general and the several sciences in particular, it serves to bridge the gulf between the humanities and the sciences by suggesting the *humanistic values* of scientific progress and by describing the *cultural matrix* in which such progress takes place.

Regular quarterly numbers contain articles, book reviews, news of current developments, and annual compilations of its famous CRITICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY. Ranging from prehistoric to modern times, over nearly every area of man's thought, this Bibliography contains an important section on the NINETEENTH CENTURY, comprising hundreds of citations on general material, the exact sciences, sciences of man, the medical sciences, pseudo-sciences, and disciplines ancillary to the history of science.

Annual subscription is $7.50 (students, $5.00), and may be sent the Treasurer, William D. Stahlman, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge 39, Massachusetts. Editorial and other communications may be sent to the Editor, I. Bernard Cohen, Widener Library 189, Cambridge 38, Massachusetts.

THE VICTORIAN FRAME OF MIND

WALTER E. HOUGHTON *Winner of the 1957 Christian Gauss Award*

". . . one of those rare and beautiful distillations of a long period of scholarship, of a saturation in the material, until the fortunate reader knows in every sentence that he is receiving the benefit of thousands and thousands of unquoted pages. I feel that this book is an essential work for every student of nineteenth-century New England and America; but more than this, I am persuaded that here is a study of immense significance in terms of method."—Perry Miller in *The New England Quarterly.* $6.00

THE RAILROAD STATION

CARROLL L. V. MEEKS

"A most significant contribution to the general history of architecture and engineering; a colourful reminder of pioneering days on the railways of Britain, the continent of Europe and of North America; and a tribute to great men like Stephenson, Brunel and Wyatt and other less well-known men who created the imposing structures that we look down upon today—as we fly out from an aerodrome, whose lineage, as Mr. Meeks points out, can be traced to those same 'engineers' glass cages.' "—*The Irish Builder & Engineer.* $7.50

Yale University Press, New Haven, Connecticut

VICTORIANA in ANVIL BOOKS

Only $1.25 each

Anvil Books are *original* paperbound studies, each presenting an outstanding scholar's analysis of a major problem area together with selected documents. Louis L. Snyder, General Editor.

No. 3—THE LATE VICTORIANS: A Short History
By Herman Ausubel, Columbia University. **Succinctly recounts the social, religious, economic and political turmoil in late Victorian England.**

No. 31—REVOLUTION AND REACTION, 1848-1852: A Mid-Century Watershed
By Geoffrey Bruun. **Vividly tells the history of the revolutions that rocked Europe in 1848 and their aftermath.**

No. 18—BRITISH CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY SINCE 1832
By Robert Livingston Schuyler, Columbia University, and Corrinne Comstock Weston, University of Houston. **Clearly depicts the role of conventional usage in shaping the British constitutional system.**

No. 10—FIFTY MAJOR DOCUMENTS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY
By Louis L. Snyder, The City College of New York

D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc. 120 Alexander St. · Princeton, New Jersey

JOWETT

A Portrait with Background

By Geoffrey Faber

A remarkable biography of the man whose personality made Balliol "a nursery of statesmen" and who transformed the whole pattern of university education by bringing Oxford and the outside world together.

"A definitive biography was long overdue, and the present volume, exhaustive, scholarly and excellently documented from much new material, fills a real void. . . . To have drawn a full-length portrait of this complex and enormously gifted character with his struggles, his delicious wit . . . his genius for friendship and to have depicted Jowett throughout with both candor and sympathy is an achievement."—

CECIL WOODHAM-SMITH, *N. Y. Times Book Review*

$6.00 through your bookseller, or from

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

79 Garden Street • Cambridge 38, Massachusetts

COMMENTS AND QUERIES

WHAT DOES "VICTORIAN" mean? For answers, see not only Maurice Reckitt's "When did 'Victorianism' End?" in this issue, but the contrasting implications of H. M. Jones' "Shaw as a Victorian" (*VS*, December 1957). A more extended attempt at definition may be found in Walter Houghton's *The Victorian Frame of Mind*, reviewed in the last issue; Mr. Houghton's first publication since his book (winner by the way of the Christian Gauss award for 1957) is an important treatment of *Empedocles on Etna* which will appear in the next number of *VS*.

F. S. BROMBERGER, Department of English, University of Redlands, Redlands, California, writes, "It would be interesting to know what American colleges teach what in the Victorian period. What do the British do with it?" Two current answers: G. F. A. Best's note in this issue; and, for literary readers, an interesting proposal by Curtis Dahl of Wheaton College, Mass., in the December *College English:* "The Victorian Challenge to Teaching: One Answer." Another answer will be a report forthcoming in *VS* on an undergraduate seminar conducted on this campus, using Darwin as its center and radiating out into all "disciplines"; it is experimental this year, but, from early reports, highly successful. And one may refer to F. R. Leavis' challenging introduction to *Mill on Bentham and Coleridge*.

ANYONE WHO DOUBTS HIS DOUBTS about history's repeating itself may be disturbed by two instances described in recent issues of *VS:* one, self-interest confusing the issues in *Punch*'s evaluation of slavery and Civil War in America (described in Oscar Maurer's article in the first number, which appeared simultaneously with the Little Rock incident); two, an astonishing foreshadowing of the current U.S.-U.S.S.R. science race and its impact on complacency in education (in George Haines' article in the present number).

OUR APOLOGIES for having neglected to indicate that Henry-Russell Hitchcock's "High Victorian Gothic," in the first issue, was an adaptation of a chapter from his forthcoming volume (*Architecture: Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries)* in the Pelican History of Art series.

REQUESTS FOR AID: John Hagan, 9 Highgate Avenue, London, N.6, sends the following request. "I am much interested in investigating the extent of Joseph Conrad's reading in nineteenth-century English and Continental literature, and therefore would greatly appreciate hearing from anyone who could give me a clue as to what became of his library after his death in 1928."

And from Edward S. Lauterbach, Department of English, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.: "For use in a history of the humor magazine *Fun* (1861-1901) I would like to locate account books, records, diaries, letters and other pertinent material. I am particularly interested in the two early proprietors Charles M'Lean and Edward Wylam; Henry James Byron, Matt Morgan, Fred Burnand, Tom Hood the younger, Gordon Thomson, Jeff Prowse, Henry Sampson, George R. Sims, W. S. Gilbert, Ambrose Bierce, and Tom Robertson. I would also like to communicate with any relatives of the Dalziel brothers, George Newness, Charles Shurey, Jas. F.

("Jassef") Sullivan, John William Houghton, and James Clayton Clarke ("Kyd"). I shall be grateful for any help."

HAVING – modestly – repeated, in the December "Comments and Queries" columns, some rather elaborate praise of *VS* in the London *Times Literary Supplement*, we have conveniently created a precedent for quoting Stephen F. Fogle, of the University of Florida, who reviewed the first number of *VS* in the Autumn *Victorian Newsletter:* "First reaction to this new venture among the scholarly journals must be enthusiastic . . . it is hard to see how any university or college library will be able to do without *Victorian Studies*, and it is likely that many scholars who are content to read the library's copy of other journals will feel stirred to run their own files of this one." The British *Library Review* for Winter, 1957, calls *VS* "one of the most distinguished accomplishments we have seen in the post-war period. . . . We heartily commend 'Victorian Studies' to our readers everywhere: it should be taken in every library." Perhaps this is an appropriate place to notify readers that our supply of back issues is diminishing rapidly, and that it would be well to make sure – quickly – that your library gets its complete file.

CONTRIBUTORS

G. F. A. BEST, Fellow of Trinity Hall and Assistant Lecturer in History, Cambridge University. Edited the *Cambridge Review*, 1953-54, has published articles on nineteenth-century church and state, and is writing a history of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

BRISON D. GOOCH, Assistant Professor of History at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Author of monographs on the Crimean War and presently working on Belgian diplomatic and political problems, 1847-1853.

GEORGE HAINES, IV, Charles J. MacCurdy Professor of History at Connecticut College. Author of numerous essays in literary criticism and cultural history and of the recent *German Influence upon English Education and Science, 1800-1866.*

ANTHONY QUINTON, of New College, Oxford, is a member of the Advisory Board of *Victorian Studies.*

MAURICE B. RECKITT, former editor of *Christendom, a Journal of Christian Sociology*, and author (with Dr. J. V. Langmead-Casserley) of *The Vocation of England* and of *Maurice to Temple: A Century of the Social Movement in the Church of England.*

C. E. TANZY, Assistant Instructor in English at The Ohio State University. At present working on the economic relationships of novelists and publishers in nineteenth-century England.

ADVICE TO CONTRIBUTORS

VICTORIAN STUDIES *encourages contributors always to state or clearly imply the relevance of their work not just to a particular branch of knowledge but to the whole Victorian age. Such a statement or implication need not involve a concession in depth or detail, but it does require a deliberate attempt to "place" the article in its Victorian context and so to give a clear sense of its likely significance to a given reader of* VICTORIAN STUDIES.

Manuscripts should be styled to accord with the *MLA Style Sheet* (copies of which can be had from the Treasurer, Modern Language Association, 6 Washington Square North, New York 3, N. Y., for 50¢). All matter should be double-spaced and footnotes should be typed together at the end of the article. An editorial decision can usually be reached more quickly if two copies are submitted. A stamped, self-addressed envelope should accompany all manuscripts. Authors should, of course, retain a copy for themselves.

THE HOLLENBECK PRESS, INC.

VICTORIAN STUDIES